DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 182 027 PS 011 180

AUTHOR Martinez, Kenneth A.; Arenas, Soledad
TITLE Bilingual/Multicultural Early Childhood Education: Proceedings of Head Start Regional Conferences, 1978-79.
INSTITUTION InterAmerica Research Associates, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Administration for Children, Youth, and Families (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 78p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; Cultural Factors; Curriculum Development; Curriculum Evaluation; *Early Childhood Education; *Educational Policy; Educational Testing; Educational Theories; Leadership Styles; Models; *Multicultural Education; *Program Development; Psycholinguistics; Staff Improvement
IDENTIFIERS *Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

This summary of the presentation given at four Head Start Regional Bilingual/Multicultural Conferences consists of materials related to the Head Start Strategy for Spanish-speaking Children. Keynote addresses focus on Head Start policy implications, the future of Head Start in the 1980s, and the relation of bilingual/bicultural programs to the Head Start Program. Papers presented include descriptions of assessment efforts and explorations of the application of early childhood theories to bilingual/multicultural children. Also included are research studies as well as curriculum development and evaluation efforts. Guides for training staff to meet the special needs of bilingual/multicultural children, descriptions of a resource center network, and an exploration of leadership styles are also provided. It is hoped that the information contained in the report will give the reader a better understanding of the issues associated with early childhood bilingual/multicultural education. (Author/RH)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED182027

# BILINGUAL/MULTICULTURAL EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION:

## Proceedings of Head Start Regional Conferences

## 1978-79

Kenneth A. Martinez

Soledad Arenas

PS 01180

Head Start Strategy for Spanish-Speaking Children
Administration for Children, Youth and Families
Office of Human Development Services
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Washington, D.C.

## PREFACE

In 1975 the Administration for Children, Youth and Families (ACYF) initiated the Head Start Strategy for Spanish-speaking Children. The purpose of this effort was to develop, within the Head Start program, the capacity to implement sound bilingual/bicultural preschool programs. The four areas addressed under this Strategy (curriculum development, staff development, research, and dissemination) have progressed through the planning, developnent, and pilot-testing phases. The current phase involves the dissemination of the products of the Strategy. The focus of this dissemination will be Head Start programs serving bilingual/bicultural children.

The initial step in the dissemination phase was the dissemination of information by means of a series of four Regional Head Start Bilingual/Multicultural Conferences held in San Francisco, California; San Antonio, Texas; Chicago, Illinois; and New York City, New York. The purpose of these conferences was to share the products of the Strategy with regional ACYF staff and Head Start staff from throughout the nation.

These proceedings present a summary of the presentations made at these four conferences. I hope the information provides you with a better understanding of what has taken place under the aegis of the Strategy, as well as a better understanding of issues associated with early childhood bilingual/multicultural education.

Soledad Arenas, Director
Head Start Strategy for
Spanish-speaking Children

*These proceedings were produced by InterAmerica Research Associates pursuant to a contract with ACYF/OHDS/DHEW. Points of view or opinions expressed do not necessarily represent the official views or opinions of the funding agency.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Preface | |
| Soledad Arenas, Director, Head Start Strategy for Spanish-Speaking Children | iii |
| Keynote Addresses | |
| HEAD START POLICY IMPLICATIONS<br>Blandina Cardenas-Ramirez | 2 |
| HEAD START IN THE 1980's<br>Ray Collins | 5 |
| BILINGUAL/BICULTURAL EFFORT: AN INTEGRAL PART OF HEAD START<br>Jenni Klein | 11 |
| Head Start Bilingual/Multicultural Programs | |
| ACYF's EFFORTS TO ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF SPANISH-SPEAKING CHILDREN<br>Soledad Arenas | 17 |
| Bilingual/Multicultural Early Childhood Theories | |
| EARLY CHILDHOOD THEORIES AND THEIR APPLICATION TO UNDERSTANDING THE DEVELOPMENT OF YOUNG BILINGUAL/MULTICULTURAL CHILDREN<br>Judith Ramirez | 21 |
| EARLY CHILDHOOD THEORIES AND THE BILINGUAL/BICULTURAL CHILD<br>Gloria Zamora | 25 |
| Bilingual/Multicultural Early Childhood Research | |
| BILINGUALISM: A DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLINGUISTIC APPROACH<br>Eugene Garcia | 29 |
| Bilingual/Multicultural Curriculum Development and Evaluation | |
| Curriculum Development | |
| ¡ALERTA! CURRICULUM MODEL<br>Leslie Williams | 41 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)


Page

Bilingual/Multicultural Curriculum Development and Evaluation

Curriculum Development (continued)

NUEVAS FRONTERAS DE APRENDIZAJE
Barbara Cox 48

THE RELEVANCE OF CULTURE TO TEACHING AND LEARNING IN PRESCHOOL CLASSROOMS
Manuel Ramirez 50

UN MARCO ABIERTO CURRICULUM MODEL
Michael L. Hanes
M. Isabel Flores 54

AMANECER CURRICULUM MODEL
Rebecca Barerra 60

Curriculum Evaluation

EVALUATION OF BILINGUAL/BICULTURAL CURRICULUM MODELS
Luis Moll 64

Bilingual/Multicultural Staff Training

PREPARING STAFF TO MEET THE SPECIAL NEEDS OF BILINGUAL/MULTICULTURAL CHILDREN
Jeannette Watson 66

Testing Bilingual/Multicultural Preschool Children

EL CIRCO: AN ASSESSMENT BATTERY FOR USE WITH PRESCHOOL-AGED, SPANISH-SPEAKING CHILDREN
Diana Glad 70

Resource Center Network

NATIONAL BILINGUAL/MULTICULTURAL RESOURCE NETWORK
Yolanda Molina
Iris Sutherland
Masako Tanaka
Steve DelCastillo 76

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

Page

Leadership Styles

LEADERSHIP STYLES AND THEIR IMPORTANCE IN HEAD START PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION
JoAnn Vasquez 79

## KEYNOTE ADDRESSES

### HEAD START POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Blandina Cardenas-Ramirez, Commissioner
Administration for Children, Youth and Families

We in Head Start need to understand the relationships that exist between what we are doing and the policies under which we are operating. People working in Head Start and other child development areas have long hoped and worked for a comprehensive child development policy, and believed such a policy was possible. This belief is probably a carry-over from the era of Head Start's beginnings, when everything was possible and any program had a good chance of being funded if it was founded on good intentions. This was an era that was well worth the energy and resources that were brought to bear on the lives of people.

Tremendous strides have been made by the programs which began in this era in opening up avenues for involvement in the decision-making process, such as, opportunities to participate in the government. These strides would not have been made had there been less courage and ambition on the part of people at the policy-making level and people in the programs.

Of all of the programs that developed out of this era, Head Start has, to a greater extent than the others, fulfilled its promises. Head Start is a program of some 1300 grantees which translates into 1800 delegate agencies. These programs are run, at the federal level, with less than 200 people in a direct federal-to-community relationship. This has been possible because we have had the right kind of people involved at the federal and community levels, so that we have a smoothly running system despite meager financial resources. Because of this Head Start represents a miracle of federal government administration. The reason for this miracle is that resources for the program are put in the hands of people with the greatest stake in the program's success.

From a policy perspective, Head Start represents not one program, but several. Head Start is currently a health delivery system for poor children. We run what most assessments have determined is the most effective delivery system for health services run by the federal government. Most assessments of Head Start have also revealed that we are running the best delivery system for child nutrition and nutrition education being run by the federal government today. Our Social Services delivery system is working extremely well, although not uniformly so. Social Services appear to be more successful in those parts of the nation that have traditionally been more receptive to such services, such as in the Northeast and the Midwest, than they are in the Southeast. Insofar as our Educational Services are concerned, we find, generally, a high level of appropriateness. However, we do not have the unitary excellence in these programs that we find in our health and nutrition services. All of these programs are working far better than we have the right to expect, given the amount of staff and resources put into the effort, and considering the fact that over fifty percent of the people working for Head Start are working for minimum wage.

We have a policy that says that no child should go hungry. This policy is implemented in the nutrition services. However, we are only feeding 35% of the eligible children.

We have a policy that says a child ought not to be sick, that his/her illness ought not to go undiagnosed or untreated. The program addressing this policy is the EPSDT. In spite of the fact that this program is an entitlement program, only about 10% of eligible children in our country are being served by this program.

We have a policy that says that if a child is developmentally different, physically or mentally developmentally different, the child ought to be provided the same opportunity as other children. This policy is contained in the Education for Handicapped Children Act, and yet we know that because of the interpretations of this policy, the resources available to meet these needs will delay its full implementation.

We have another policy that says if a child is poor or is otherwise living in an environment which might not provide appropriate developmental opportunities, these opportunities should be provided. This policy is enunciated in Head Start. Yet, Head Start only serves 20% of the children who are in need.

What we have in these policies are the foundations of what amounts to a comprehensive policy of child development.

As we learn and as we educate people, we will more fully develop that policy base, but until we have increased the availability of the services in any one of the categories mentioned above, we will not be able to realize a comprehensive policy.

Nothing is more compatible with the Head Start philosophy than a policy which seeks, over time and in an intelligent and constructive fashion, to respond to the comprehensive needs of all children. The only appropriate response must be a comprehensive child development program which includes bilingual education. There are many places in our society where bilingual education is appropriate, not only for children who may come to the educational experience speaking two languages, but for all of the children who come into the experience to have the opportunity to learn more than one language.

The history of policy-making around cultural and language issues which effect the educational opportunities for children is not a short lived one. Although bilingual education was first introduced in 1964, at the same time all of these other programs were being introduced, historians can point to a long history of bilingual education in the nation's schools. Up until the First World War, many communities had bilingual education programs for their children. Many parochial schools were, in fact, culturally and linguistically tuned to particular communities because the staff in those schools usually reflected the culture and language of the children in those communities.

Since the Civil Rights movement in the sixties there has been a renewal in the interest in bilingual education in the nation, both as part of the civil rights and self-actualization movements. Bilingual education in this country has grown, not only in terms of its implementation, but most importantly, it has grown in terms of the hopes and aspirations and dreams of peoples from different language backgrounds. What had originally been a Hispanic effort is now something which many language groups aspire to for their children.

The term "appropriate" is being used here from a sociological perspective... "That it is desirable for all children to learn more than one language." If you think about it from a sociological perspective, there are situations where it is extremely appropriate for the children in that context to learn the languages that are appropriate to the ecology in which they are living. There are ecological settings in which it is not only desirable, but appropriate, in terms of having the educational system serve the needs of that ecology, for all children to be involved in bilingual education. There are other ecological settings in which the bilingual education response may more appropriately be focused on a small group of children. In all cases it should be one that proceeds from the judgment of program consumators about the most appropriate pedagogical response and judgment of parents as policy-makers about the most appropriate needs of their own children.

In Head Start we have everything we need to make it (bilingual education) work. First of all, we respond comprehensively to the needs of the child. Head Start can set the pace for bilingual education.

What we have done in ACYF is to proceed slowly with regard to bilingual education. We have paced ourselves in developing an approach to CDA and bilingual education. We have gone slowly in developing alternative curriculum models around bilingual education and we have modeled the evaluation of our activities so that information will be provided which will add significantly to the information on which policies can be made about bilingual education. In lieu of this information, you need to understand what is happening at the present time. First of all, bilingual children are increasing in numbers daily. Secondly, communities are daily articulating their needs for bilingual-multicultural education. Thirdly, Head Start parents from across the nation have endorsed bilingual education. Finally, the Head Start leadership has been supportive of bilingual education.

I would like to have you all go away from this workshop with a real sense of what bilingual education means and how essential bilingual education is to fulfill the promise of Head Start.

# HEAD START IN THE 1980's

Ray Collins, Chief
Head Start Development and
Planning Division, ACYF

Today I want to talk about Head Start in the 1970's.

Historians tell us that past is prologue. However, I believe that if we are going to understand the Head Start of the future, we need to make sure we understand the Head Start of this decade, and indeed, the Head Start from its inception in 1965 to the present.

Today I will give you a quick overview of how I see this history and then try to pose some of the implications of this for policy-makers, decision-makers in Washington and elsewhere throughout the country, for program practitioners, teachers, parents, researchers, program developers, and others. I will address many questions, including those which preoccupied the nation at the outset of the Head Start decade, such as:

Is Head Start working?

What are the outcomes of a Head Start experience with children with different characteristics?

What impact does Head Start have on families in the community?

What program characteristics facilitate children's learning and developement?

What should be the goals and program strategy of a Head Start teacher?

What should be Head Start's bilingual-multicultural strategy in the 1980's?

Certainly the Head Start of the 60's was launched with tremendous promise. There were great expectations (during those) magic years. Some people believed that a brief summer experience of 6 or 8 weeks could work wonders in a child's life, and the balloon burst as rapidly as it had soared. The Westinghouse (evaluation of Head Start) results presented to President Nixon at the outset of his administration were interpreted as being highly disappointing. According to the study, summer Head Start produced no substantial benefits. Also, gains by graduates of full-year Head Start programs were believed to have largely disappeared by the 2nd or 3rd grade. The key issue at this point is not whether or not these findings were right or wrong; that has been debated for far too long. Westinghouse became a classic for policy analysts. Unfortunately, the report came to influence perceptions of policy-makers very heavily, and researchers (were influenced) to an amazing extent. Happily, it was ignored by parents, teachers, and other practitioners, who preferred to rely on their own instincts of what was happening based on the feedback they got from the children as they saw them on a day-to-day basis.

So here it (Westinghouse report) did not exert an influence, but it did exert a tremendous influence on policy. It led rather directly to President Nixon's veto of the Mondale/Brademas Child Care Act of 1975 did not go anyplace, and it may be that the ghost of the study had something to do with the very rapid demise of the Child Care Act of 1979. At the heart of the controversy is a lack of clarity about the program's goals. If you do not know where you are going, you will never know when you get there. We need to be clear about our goals.

An enormous number of goals have been attributed to Head Start by various people over the years. One goal is to prepare children for school. A second goal is to increase IQ scores. A third goal is to eliminate poverty. A fourth goal is to provide day care. A fifth goal is to provide special services to handicapped children. A sixth goal is to foster early childhood and family development. . .this was the emphasis of the General Accounting Office (GAO) in their report this February to Congress regarding Head Start success and the success of some of the spin-offs of Head Start, like Home Start and the Child and Family Resource Program (CFRP). The seventh goal is to promote children's social competence.

It is this latter goal that I would like to have us focus on for a moment. This is a term that is somewhat commonly misunderstood. . .probably because we have never done a very good job of explaining it. But the notion of social competence is the overriding goal of Head Start. We see the promotion of social competence, that is, the child's overall intellectual, socio-emotional and physical development, and the child's ability in and out of the school setting, as Head Start's primary goal. This is the concept that increasingly we are coming to use as our frame of reference for thinking about Head Start.

Head Start is a comprehensive program which does not focus on just one area, but tends to deal broadly with the life of the child; this current status reflects a reformulation of the historic goals (which) I believe Robert Cook and the other people that were on the initial task force that conceived Head Start in the Spring of 1965 had in mind.

Based on this reformulation of goals around 1972, when Ed Ziegler was the Director of what was then the Office of Child Development that administered Head Start, we began thinking of a series of steps that could be undertaken to revitalize Head Start and add new dimensions to the program. One of the main things that happened was a transition from summer programs to full-year programs. We have all so much accepted (this transition) that we have forgotten about it. . .it is important to remember our history sometimes. We developed the Head Start Program Performance Standards, which were officially promulgated in 1975. We developed program options to vary the models and the approaches that Head Start would use in specific communities to give parents and communities options on how they tailored their resources to respond to the needs and strengths of individual children. We now see considerable diversity in Head Start. For example, we have over 400 Head Start programs across the nation that implement some form of the Home Base model, often in conjunction with a center-based program. In 1972 Congress mandated that Head Start serve handicapped children. However, Congress did not even give us any money to implement the program. Now we have some 30 million dollars that are focused on this effort. Research and demonstration were emphasized, not only in the

area of education, but also in many other areas. We initially focused on parents and the family, building on the prior experience of Parent-Child Centers, Home Start, and the Child and Family Resource Program. Efforts targeted on special populations and a concern for children's learning sparked initiatives like the Head Start Strategy for Spanish-speaking Children; Head Start Planned Variation. . .which tied in, at least in better moments, with Follow-Through; Project Development Continuity which involved Head Start programs working with parents in the public schools; and the latest program in this area, the Basic Educational Skills Project, which was triggered by the interest of Secretary Joe Califano; and the Child and Family Mental Health Project, which emphasizes preventative mental health strategies. This represents a few of the large and important projects amidst many small and equally important ones.

Over a longer time period we will be developing measures that look at child outcomes. This is something that has triggered a great deal of concern. People are worried that maybe this means we are going to have the mandatory introduction of standardized tests. That is not going to happen. That is not what the Secretary wants. What he has asked us to do, and what we have proposed as part of long-term developmental efforts, would be a teacher developmental checklist to be used by Head Start teachers, Kindergarten teachers, and first grade teachers. They might elect to use the checklist, if they felt it was appropriate to their needs, to try to collect follow-up information as to what happens to children after they leave Head Start in terms of appropriate class placement: Are children getting tracked into special education inappropriately or are they getting appropriate kinds of placement? Are Head Start children staying on grade level and being promoted with their peers? There are a number of research studies that suggest the Head Start direction in this area is very positive. The Secretary asks that programs gather information that could be shared with the Congress which could be the basis for corrective action, if corrective action is needed. This is something we are approaching in an exploratory, developmental way.

What success has Head Start achieved over the past decade? First, it is clear that Head Start facilitates children's social competence. Head Start has (been involved in) over 50 studies since 1969, since the Westinghouse study, and the results are uniformly positive. I have reviewed every single study personally and some of them in considerable depth. They do include gains in children's intelligence, they do include gains for Head Start on standardized tests, and, more importantly, they include real-world benefits, like keeping children on grade level, keeping them out of inappropriate placements and special education. The children's health status has improved, there has been lower absenteeism, fewer cases of anemia, more immunizations, and better nutritional practices. Head Start also facilitates important areas of child socialization. Social maturity behavior leads to positive changes in parent-child interaction. These are benefits that are present not only at the conclusion of the child's participation in Head Start, but are sustained through the years as the child leaves the program. Interestingly enough, we are seeing parallel studies in child development. . .most notably the Developmental Continuity research that is showing the same kind of gains, the same pattern of benefits for child development programs that Head Start is showing. I think we have been seeing a complete reversal in the policy climate in the last two years. There is a much better appreciation of the benefits of early childhood education and child development than we had

before, where there were major questions such as: "Are these programs producing gains?" We have the answer to that question now and it is a very encouraging answer. We need to build on that.

Benefits are particularly noteworthy for handicapped children. We recently completed a two-year evaluation of the handicapped effort and collected information via tests, observations, teacher ratings, interviews with parents, and parent ratings. This study involved a national sample of about 50 Head Start programs. It involved a comparable-sized group of non-Head Start preschool programs. There were about 200 children who were not in any special treatment program. The gains for children were clearly a result of their participation in a program. These included gains for speech-impaired children. People are concerned that there are too many speech-impaired children who are classified as handicapped. Indeed, we need to be concerned about that because some of the linguistically-different children may be misclassified; but it is also equally clear that there are children with genuine speech handicaps.

The thing I think surprised the evaluators were the gains experienced by Head Start children. The gains of these children were consistently judged by every measure used in the study as "good as" or "better" than the gains by children in a non-Head Start preschool program. Yet, these other preschool programs were better-funded and had teachers with more degrees. The Head Start programs, however, had teachers with more experience, interestingly, in working with handicapped children. A lot of other factors, like class size and training, were important in these differences.

We have experienced success in the area of Head Start program innovation. We have follow-up longitudinal results on children who were in Home Start; the preliminary results show sustained gain by children who are in first and second grades at the present time who participated in these programs. These were scores on nationally standardized tests. The children were at the 60th percentile on nationally normed reading tests and the 45th percentile on math scores. These are very impressive results and, moreover, the child's school achievement level was unrelated to their initial socio-economic status. This fact suggests that the program unlocked the bind that most minority children have--that their socio-emotional background predicts their achievement scores. We have seen a reversal of that in the case of these children. These are just a sampling of some of the positive findings that we are getting.

Now, let me briefly sketch out what some of the implications of this are for 1980.

We have answered the question, "Is Head Start working?", and the answer is a resounding "YES!!!". We know at least something more (and here we have to be somewhat modest in our statement). We know something more about the outcomes of the Head Start experience for children with different characteristics. We know something more about what effect a Head Start program has on families in the communities. We know, for example, that Black children gain dramatically in Head Start. At least one major study points to even more dramatic gains for Hispanic children, particularly in the area of language acquisition. The parent who was concerned about whether the child was going to learn English in Head Start would relax if he or she saw these results. We have detailed impressive benefits for handicapped children. We know much less about the children's

socialization, self-concept, and like areas. Additional research is going to give us major insights into these areas.

The average benefits for Head Start children are absolutely worthless to a teacher. They only reassure her of what she already knows, which is that she is doing, in a general way, something that elicits gains and benefits for kids. But she wants to know, in a particular way, "How does she do something better for a particular child?". Research, so far, has not helped much. We do know something more that can help program practitioners, Head Start directors in particular, and parents. We know that the parent is indeed the child's most important learning and development resource. That message has moved beyond rhetoric. We can document that with a lot of research evidence. After the parent comes the child's teacher. The role of the teacher underscores the importance of teacher training through CDA and other programs. Other key variables are group size, class size, the child-staff ratio, and mainstreaming for handicapped children which provides a setting where they can play and learn with non-handicapped children.

The following represent a few of the future goals for Head Start:

(1) Extending services to children under age 3, moving down to focus on early childhood and family development from the prenatal period on.

(2) Head Start programs need to work more clearly with the public schools to foster continuity in the child's learning.

(3) We need a closer partnership with Day Care.

Finally, let me offer some tentative comments about Head Start bilingual-multicultural strategy for the 1980's. I do not have any firsthand experience with bilingualism or multiculturalism in this country. I do have some experience in other cultures, non-western cultures, both my own and my family and children. We need to be about the business of devising the next phase of our bilingual-multicultural strategy. We have focused initially on the Spanish-speaking because they comprise 15% of the Head Start community. However, reaching out beyond that to other groups is intrinsic to Head Start. First, we need to work with ACYF regions to disseminate the results of the best practices to date, regions should be encouraged to incorporate bilingual-multicultural efforts as a priority aspect of their regular Head Start operations. Secondly, we should emphasize CDA training. I am underscoring here the key role of teachers. If I were more familiar with the cultures and the family circumstances, I might have a strategy to propose with parents, but I do not. We have come a long way in CDA, and we have come a long way in applying in CDA concepts in the bilingual-multicultural area. We need to build on that so it becomes a large scale effort. These efforts are significant, but they are only beginnings and they are small scale. CDA is a key to doing that on a large scale basis. Thirdly, we need to develop new curriculum models for the Spanish-speaking, but beyond that, we need models that focus on the linguistic needs and cultural and family circumstances of other groups. . .Native Americans, Asians, migrants, and all the major groups in our society. We are ready to do that and we have the foundation on which we can begin to apply the approaches that you have pioneered in this and other areas. Fourthly, linkages need to be forged with the public schools to create continuity. I realize that the public

schools' effort and the bilingual field have been the subject of tremendous controversy in the public arena, and I suspect in your private arenas; however, we need to move beyond that. We need to find ways to forge the common ground. Very little is being done in bilingualism in public schools that reaches the preschool arena. Very little is being done with Head Start in the area of bilingualism that reaches out to the public schools. That ought to be a major emphasis.

Finally, we need to initiate further research and experimentation. We need to research the major issues of child learning, of family styles, of how to organize and tailor large scale program experimentation. We need to address special situations and strengths of Blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and other groups. I think this research should include a special emphasis on Parent-Child Centers, the Child and Family Resource Program, and Home Start--in other words, efforts centered on children in the context of the family and not just the classroom.

The only way that Head Start can foster children's social competence is by focusing on the individual child and the individual family, in all the uniqueness of that family. That is part of what Head Start is all about, and I think that ought to be a major focus for Head Start in the 1980's.

# BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL EFFORT: AN INTEGRAL PART OF HEAD START

Jenni Klein, Director
Educational Services, ACYF

I am not Spanish-speaking, but I am bilingual and very much in tune with the bilingual (education) effort. I think this bilingual effort is one of the most important efforts of Head Start.

This morning I want to talk to you briefly about Head Start. Though most of you here are familiar with Head Start, I would like to put it into context. I also want to talk to you a little about developments within Head Start over the years and to try to answer the question, "Where are we (in Head Start) now?"

## Planning for Head Start

I believe Head Start to be the largest and most significant early childhood program in our nation serving economically disadvantaged children and their families. It was initiated in 1965 as one of the programs under the aegis of the Economic Opportunity Act and presently has a budget of $625 million. Hopefully, within the next few weeks, the budget will be at $680 million. The decision rests with the Congress.

Head Start has expanded dramatically from its initial beginning as a "summer" program. I estimate this increase to be four-fold.

The most interesting aspect of Head Start is that the early statements made by the planning group and stated in the Cook Memo are still the cornerstone of Head Start today. I also believe they are the cornerstone for many other child development programs in the nation. The key elements of the Cook Memo are that: (1) the early years are important, (2) intervention in the early years will include learning patterns, socio-emotional development and formation of aspirations and expectations for children and their parents, (3) comprehensive services such as education, health, social services, and mental health are needed for success and must be included, (4) the program must be tailored to meet the needs of individual children, individual families, and individual communities, (5) program objectives must be geared to improve the child's functioning in a broad sense, not just educationally, and (6) parents must be involved in program planning and administration. If you take these elements and apply them to bilingual-bicultural education, the indication is clearly there that in order to serve all children you must relate to the children's ethnic background, their culture, and their language.

Personally, I believe the genius of Head Start lies in its involvement of parents and the stress it places on the individual needs of children, families, and communities.

Head Start Developments

As pointed out previously, Head Start began in 1965 with only summer programs. This was a period of evaluation. As a result of the evaluation that was done, the decision was made that Summer Head Start programs were not enough; we needed to expand to full-year programs. As Head Start began to expand to full-year status, experimental/demonstration programs began to develop in response to two questions:

1. Who shall we serve?
2. How can we best provide and deliver these services?

Head Start will always be looking for new ways, which is another of its strengths. I believe that Head Start needs to constantly be improved.

This experimental/demonstration effort involved the following three phases:

1. Development of programs to meet the needs of children.
2. Testing and evaluating developmental efforts, making changes where necessary, and replication.
3. Distribution and dissemination.

The above represents an overview of the experimental/demonstration effort. Now I would like to show you how the parts of this effort fit into the whole Head Start effort.

Originally, Head Start was only serving infant and preschool children. The question was asked, "Should we serve younger children?" As a result of this question, thirty-three (33) Parent-Child Centers, some of whom are serving children ages zero (0) to three (3), were developed.

The next question asked was, "What happens when children leave Head Start?" In response to this question, an experimental project was initiated, called Project Developmental Continuity. The idea behind this experimental effort was to determine if we can provide a system that supports services for children all the way through public school. There are twelve (12) Developmental Continuity programs across the nation, several focusing on Hispanic populations.

Continuing on with experimental efforts. . .as you know, current legislation states that we must serve handicapped children in 10% of the slots in Head Start programs. I believe that Head Start has led the way insofar as mainstreaming handicapped children is concerned. Many programs are now copying our effort--and we are glad that we are doing so--for our concern is that Head Start and public schools provide a continuity of services for handicapped children. Through the handicapped effort Head Start established the Resource Access Project (RAP) in order to provide Technical Assistance to programs serving handicapped children. The focus of this effort is to assist programs in meeting the needs of handicapped children and to show them how they can use these same methods and materials with non-handicapped children.

Another important effort regarding how services shall be provided is the Home Start program. Home Start was initiated in response to questions

regarding how to serve children who do not go to a center-based program and how to work with the parents of these children in order to deliver the services available through Head Start centers.

Another part of the developmental effort is the EPSDT. We have been working with Head Start programs on an experimental basis, trying to get them involved in this program so that the children in Head Start programs would receive extended medical services. The experimental programs have worked extremely well despite the fact that EPSDT has not been serving children across the nation who should be served.

Also included in the developmental effort is the Child and Family Mental Health Project. This experimental program focuses on the delivery of mental health services to families of Head Start children.

The Child and Family Resource Program (CFRP) is another developmental effort. CFRP is now in all of the (DHEW) regions in eleven (11) programs. The focus of this program is children aged zero (0) to eight (8) and their families. The program is designed to serve the family as a total unit. The program refers children and families to the kinds of services they need. Information from this effort will help us find answers to the questions, "What age group should we serve?" and "Who should we serve?".

Another program that was just started is the Basic Educational Skills Project. This is not a "back to basics" program. It is the only demonstrational program that was started at the request of an HEW Secretary. All other demonstrational programs were originally conceived in ACYF. The focus of the program is on enhancing developmentally appropriate basic educational skills in Head Start, and will continue into the elementary school grades. The Basic Educational Skills program focuses on four elements:

1. Curriculum and learning attitudes (child's self-concept as a learner).
2. Parent involvement as it relates to children's acquisition of basic educational skills.
3. Teacher attitudes and behaviors (how teachers can work with children to facilitate the acquisition of basic educational skills).
4. Continuity of services extending the Head Start experience through a child's school life.

This year, two (2) of the Basic Educational Skills Project programs are bilingual. Next year we will fund approximately thirty-five (35) programs under the Basic Educational Skills Project, and I am sure we will have bilingual-multicultural programs in this group.

We should keep in mind that all of these experimental efforts, or special programs, were initiated to test theories related to the questions referred to above, with the idea in mind that eventually those demonstrations that prove successful will become part of the Head Start effort.

The bilingual education effort was initiated because the question occurred to all of us, "What happens to children who come to Head Start speaking a different

language and how can we best serve them?", as well as the question, "How can we support the culture of these children going into the Head Start program?". I will not discuss what ACYF has done regarding this effort, as you will be exposed to this during the rest of the conference.

Lastly, we funded the CDA (Child Development Associate) programs as kind of a frame around all of the programs. While all of the other development efforts eventually should permeate all Head Start programs, the CDA program, in a way, encircles them. Through CDA, training is available for staff. I am a firm believer that we (Head Start) constantly need to train staff.

The bilingual effort is involved with CDA training. In addition to the general CDA credential, there is now a bilingual (Spanish) CDA credential. Hopefully this will lead the way for credentials for other areas, e.g., Home Visitors.

## Head Start--A Comprehensive Unit

I would like to move on to a discussion of where we are now. Every program that we started was started with a purpose. Every program that we have started has an evaluation component, and every program changes as it grows, which makes it very hard for the evaluators.

For a long time, when evaluations were done in Head Start, we excluded the children who did not speak English because we did not know how to deal with them. I think this has stopped. We need to make the bilingual population a part of the mainstream of our programs. We need to make bilingual-multicultural programs in Head Start a part of the whole. This is a challenge that all Head Start programs have to face.

Head Start is not just one program. It is one large whole made up of a lot of parts, always moving ahead, always changing, and always with a focus on the child and the family.

The question we have to ask ourselves is, "Where are we now with all of these programs?" Insofar as the bilingual-multicultural effort is concerned, we (ACYF) do have bilingual-multicultural products, and you are here today to learn something about them. We do have Performance Standards which relate to serving children who come to Head Start with a different language and/or culture. We are in the process of revising the Performance Standards, and there will be a heavy emphasis on serving children who speak different language and/or come from different cultural backgrounds.

Head Start serves many different families through the variety of approaches that I have mentioned, many different children, and different ages of children. We are working more and more in the area of continuity to ensure that what they learn in Head Start is continued as they go into public schools. We are serving children who have a variety of needs through many bilingual-multicultural programs.

We have come a long way, but we still have a long way to go. We are serving only 20% of the eligible Head Start population, and out of this population, I

believe, we have about 15% that are Spanish-speaking, but not all of them are being served by a bilingual program.

If you ask yourself, "What is Head Start all about?", the answer might easily be that Head Start was initiated to serve those children who traditionally have been left out. We must be certain that Head Start serves the children from all sectors of that group. I believe that children who speak a different language have been traditionally left out.

The bilingual-multicultural effort, which is something that is not new anymore, is, on the one hand, not serving all the children that need to be served; however, on the other hand, it has provided us with the knowledge to serve other children. What is needed now is to spread this knowledge and to integrate it into Head Start.

In any program where there are children who do not speak English there needs to be someone there who understands their language, who can help them gain English skills, and who can work with them in their language.

We need to concern ourselves with issues which relate not only to bilingual programs, but to the total Head Start program. Among these issues are:

1. The need for more teachers that speak the children's language, not just the assistants.
2. The need for a multicultural curriculum that focuses not just on superficial parts of the culture (e.g., foods, holidays, customs, music, etc.).
3. The need to provide training, much of it in-service, that is culturally and linguistically relevant to all staff.
4. The need to determine how to provide training in other support services (e.g., speech therapists, handicapped specialist, psychologists, mental health specialists) to people who are multilingual.
5. The need to give technical assistance to bilingual sites, not just focusing on bilingual education. We need to get the bilingual-multicultural effort into the mainstream of Head Start, and people who provide technical assistance to Head Start need to include that as part of their responsibilities.

Head Start focuses on the whole child. We need to look at the bilingual strategy as part of the whole educational strategy (of Head Start). Just like we cannot take apart the child, although we provide services in health, education, etc., it is the whole child we are serving--that is how we have to use the bilingual-multicultural strategy. We have to look at it separately, then put it all together. We have to have a bilingual-multicultural strategy that is not just a special time of the day, not just for special children, not only for certain activities, not something that is done specially by somebody who comes in (from outside). It needs to be part of the total program. In addition, we need to focus on the whole child within the bilingual component. We also need to stress that language is not just for communication and pleasure. I hope we can carry all of this off in a natural atmosphere where staff can speak in both languages and where children, parents, and staff can all work together and learn all the many experiences that are made available in Head Start. Thank you.

## HEAD START BILINGUAL/MULTICULTURAL PROGRAMS

### ACYF's EFFORTS TO ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF SPANISH-SPEAKING CHILDREN

Soledad Arenas, Director
Head Start Strategy for Spanish-Speaking Children

I am very proud of what we have been involved in at the national level and am eager to share with you what we have learned from this effort.

We have developed resources and are here today to share them with you and to learn what your concerns are. Through working together these next two days, we can build a better program to serve our children.

This is one in a series of four cluster regional bilingual-multicultural conferences that are being held to discuss how to implement programs to better meet the needs of bilingual-multicultural children.

We all have one thing in common. All of us are in one way or another responsible for offering guidance or T/TA to Head Start programs in meeting the special needs of bilingual-multicultural children.

I am certain all of you are familiar with the Head Start Performance Standards and the requirements for addressing the special needs of bilingual-multicultural children. Regardless of whether 80% of the children or only two or three in a program are bilingual, we are required to meet their needs.

Two or three years ago meeting this requirement posed a problem for many Head Start Directors. First, there was limited guidance as to what constituted a preschool bilingual-bicultural program, and second, there was a dearth of bilingual-bicultural curriculum materials. I am pleased to say that is not the case today. We have come a long way in developing the capacity for Head Start programs to be able to implement sound bilingual-multicultural programs.

Four years ago we were asking ourselves, "How is Head Start meeting the needs of Spanish-speaking children?" "What are these children's special needs?" "What do we need to do in order to meet their needs?" We also asked ourselves, "What do we need to do in order for Head Start to be able to implement sound bilingual-bicultural programs?"

We did a regional survey of how the regions perceived the needs of bilingual Head Start children, and to determine the type of bilingual-bicultural materials, curriculum and training programs that were available. We found materials were limited. There were no bilingual-bicultural curriculum models that reflected the Head Start philosophy. Competencies for training bilingual-bicultural preschool staff had not been defined, and research on which to base decisions was very limited. Based on the needs expressed through our survey and our assumption of what constituted a sound bilingual-bicultural program, we developed a strategy at the national ACYF office in 1975, which, when implemented, would eventually develop the capacity for Head Start programs to be able to implement sound bilingual-bicultural programs. We called this effort <u>The Head Start Strategy for Spanish-Speaking Children</u>.

Under this effort, we are funding developments in the following four areas: (1) Staff Training, (2) Curriculum Development, (3) Research, and (4) Resource Center Network.

With regard to Staff Training, the first effort, funded in 1975, was the establishment of four bilingual-bicultural CDA training programs. These programs not only trained bilingual-bicultural CDA's, but also developed training models which will be available for HSST/CDA contractors, grantees or institutions that offer bilingual-bicultural CDA training. The training models are based on the six core CDA competencies, plus two additional competencies considered essential for staff working with bilingual-bicultural children. At the same time, we worked closely with the CDA Consortium in helping them develop a bilingual-bicultural CDA credentialing system. The Consortium is now awarding bilingual-bicultural CDA credentials.

Parallel to this CDA training effort, we also funded two institutions to train bilingual-bicultural CDA trainers. Here again, not only did they provide instruction, they also developed trainer models for replication. One of the models was developed by Contracting Corporation of America of Denver, Colorado and the other one was developed by the Department of Community Affairs, Austin, Texas.

In the area of Curriculum Development, ACYF is presently supporting the development of four preschool bilingual-multicultural curriculum models. Within a three-year period four institutions, in cooperation with Head Start programs, will each have developed, implemented and validated a model. Each model will provide for instruction in two languages and will have these features in common: will be based on sound theoretical knowledge; will embody an observable, distinct approach to education consistent with early childhood development; will incorporate cultural references that are relevant for the children being served; and will be reflective of Head Start philosophy.

Although all four models will follow the same basic requirements, each will reflect unique characteristics. The models will differ because of different dialectical and cultural values endemic to the populations being served and the regions where the curriculum is being implemented. They will also differ because the developers may be defining and approaching curriculum development and bilingual-multicultural education from differing early childhood development theories. The models will reflect a spectrum of curriculum development approaches. Each model will include a component on how to train staff and parents to implement the curriculum. These four models are being developed in order to provide Head Start programs with alternative choices. After reviewing the four models, interested Head Start programs will be able to select the model that best suits their local needs and is compatible with their staff's teaching style.

As pointed out before, the models are being developed over a three-year period. During the first year, 1976, the developers prepared a draft of the model. During the second year the model was implemented at a cooperating Head Start site, revised and finalized. Presently in their third year, the models

are being piloted in two additional sites. A three and one-half year national evaluation of these models has been initiated. This evaluation will determine the effectiveness and replicability of the models. By next fall, 1979, the models will be available for dissemination. At this point, Head Start programs or private day care programs can review the models and determine whether they want to implement one of them.

Our effort in Research will address the environmental factors that influence the development of bilingual-multicultural children. We need information on the cognitive and first and second language development of bilingual children as well. We also need information on evaluation and assessment of both programs and children. ACYF is presently funding research in some of these areas.

Finally, let me briefly discuss the Resource Center Network. In response to the pressing need for assistance in introducing bilingual-multicultural concepts into Head Start programs, a regional pilot resource center was established in Denver, Colorado in 1976. This resource center provided access to bilingual-bicultural materials and technical assistance to Head Start programs in Region VIII, in implementing bilingual-bicultural strategies. The development and implementation of this resource center was to serve as a model for replication in other regions with a high concentration of bilingual families.

As of September 1978, we have replicated the resource center concept in Regions VI, II, and IX. Through these resource centers we will now make available to Head Start programs in these regions most of the bilingual-multicultural materials which are presently available in the country. These centers will provide programs with access to the CDA training models which have been developed, and by the Fall of 1979 they will also provide access to the curriculum models. They will also be able to provide training on the implementation of the models. Resource Centers in Regions II and IX will also be training 12 bilingual-bicultural CDA trainers. Because of limited funds, we funded resource centers only in regions with the highest concentration of Hispanic families. That is not to say that we do not recognize there is a need for bilingual-bicultural T/TA in other regions. We are trying to determine how this need can be met.

Regardless of what we develop at the national level, the degree to which the resources are utilized is up to you, the T/TA providers, and ultimately the local Head Start staff and community. We can provide excellent materials, but they will be of no use if they remain on the shelves. We need people like you to become the advocates in stressing the importance of developing the best possible learning environments for all children.

## BILINGUAL/MULTICULTURAL EARLY CHILDHOOD THEORIES

### EARLY CHILDHOOD THEORIES AND THEIR APPLICATION TO UNDERSTANDING THE DEVELOPMENT OF YOUNG BILINGUAL-MULTICULTURAL CHILDREN

Judith Ramirez, Ph.D.

I would like to talk with you about what four theories of human development have to say about working with bilingual-multicultural children. None of these theories deal specifically with bilingual-multicultural children, yet implications of the concepts of each theory provide a rationale for bilingual-multicultural education.

A. Psychoanalytic Theory (Neo-Freudian; Eriksonian)

This theory focuses on the socio-emotional development of human beings. The theory is based on the developmental tenet that humans have a drive toward being aware of and interacting with a widening social world.

Erikson's theory proposes eight developmental stages, from birth through adulthood. Each stage is characterized by a major task or challenge to be resolved; however, each challenge can recur at later stages. Four of the eight stages are relevant to our discussion today, inasmuch as they relate to young children:

1. Stage One--Infancy (Trust versus Mistrust)

The major task in this stage is the development of basic trust on the part of the infant that s/he can elicit needed nurturing responses from others (e.g., being fed, changed, held, etc.). Cultural patterns used in providing nurturance to infants include the ways an infant is held, fed, amused, and so forth.

2. Stage Two--Toddlerhood (Autonomy versus Shame and Doubt)

The major task of this stage is the development of a basic sense of autonomy, self-control, and independent action (initial assertiveness). Again, there are cultural influences on a young child's strivings for autonomy. Cultural influences relate to developmental tasks such as toilet training, weaning and self-feeding, efforts to move independently (e.g., crawling, walking, etc.), and so forth.

3. Stage Three--Preschool (Initiative versus Guilt)

The major task of this stage is the development of a sense of curiosity and active exploration. During this stage the child increasingly desires to do things for her/himself such as feeding and dressing her/himself, climbing, running, riding a tricycle, and so forth. Many Head Start children are in this stage, as is evidenced by their willingness to branch out from a familiar base and learn new things.

Frequently, a preschool child's explorations result in her/his getting dirty, accidentally breaking things, etc. Guilt feelings about such mishaps are unavoidable, but care must be taken that the child's initiative

is not destroyed by over-concern about staying clean, quiet, "out of trouble". Again, cultural practices influence the kinds of explorations and accomplishments the child has been exposed to and encouraged to pursue.

4. Stage Four--School Age (Industry versus Inferiority)

The major task of this stage is the development of a sense of accomplishment in mastering new skills such as reading and writing, riding a bicycle, jumping rope, making friends, and so forth. Accomplishments in this stage encompass physical, intellectual, social and emotional areas of development. The specific kinds of accomplishments young children are encouraged to pursue have a cultural base. Failure and a feeling of inferiority can be expected in children whose experiences are too difficult, too different from past experiences, or beyond the child's intellectual, physical, social or emotional abilities.

Thus, Erikson's theory posits eight stages, of which we have briefly discussed four. Each stage is characterized by a major task or challenge to be accomplished. Development may thus be viewed as occurring along a series of continua, as follows:

a. Trust ---------- Mistrust

b. Autonomy -------- Shame or Doubt

c. Initiative ------ Guilt

d. Industry -------- Inferiority

To the degree that a child's development is toward the left (or positive end) of the continuum at each stage, one can expect successful movement to the next stage. To the degree that development is toward the right (or negative end) of the continuum at each stage, one can expect the child to have difficulty at succeeding stages unless the developmental tasks of earlier stages are successfully provided for.

B. Social Learning Theory (B.F. Skinner; Behaviorism)

This theory emphasizes the role of the environment in shaping behavior. Humans, according to this theory, have a drive toward achieving satisfaction and a sense of competence. Emphasized in this theory is the importance of rewards and punishment on learning and behavior. If a child's behavior is rewarded (praised, accepted, acknowledged) it is likely to be repeated. On the other hand, if a child's behavior is ignored or punished, that behavior is less likely to be repeated. Implications for bilingual-multicultural education are obvious. If the child's efforts to communicate, ways of relating to others, or styles of interaction are ignored or punished, they are less likely to be repeated and used and the child will feel threatened and uncomfortable in the learning environment.

C. Cognitive Development Theory (Piaget)

This theory emphasizes the development of thinking and reasoning processes in the young child. The theory supports the belief that children have an innate desire to act upon and make sense of their environment. They strive to create and use ordering devices, to group events and objects, to recognize regularities in time, sequences, and routines, and to label objects and events with increasing discrimination.

According to Piaget, language is an important mediator in children's cognitive development. It enables children to put labels on their new learnings and to organize them for longer remembering, copying, or manipulating. The implications of this theory for bilingual-multicultural children are as follows:

1. We need to use the language the child brings to the classroom to find out what understandings s/he has, what experiences are familiar and how the child thinks about them. With this knowledge we can then build from familiar events to more complex and unfamiliar events.

2. How things are classified is culturally influenced. The experiences a child has had influence the concepts s/he comes to school with. If there is nothing in the classroom (e.g., materials, language, etc.) that is similar to the child's past experiences, the child will have great difficulty developing cognitively. The results will be loss of time and incentive, and a delay in cognitive development.

The implication is clear: School programs must make certain that a match occurs between the language and culture of the child and experiences provided in the classroom.

D. Humanistic Theory (Maslow)

This theory emphasizes that development is an integrated whole involving thoughts, feelings, aspirations, values, and a drive toward self-actualization. Maslow has posited a hierarchy of needs that must be met if humans are to achieve self-actualization. The hierarchy is as follows:

1. Physiological needs (food, no pain, shelter, etc.)
2. Security (safety)
3. Esteem (from others--being loved)
4. Self-esteem (valuing one's self, one's skills and abilities)
5. Self-actualization (development of one's skills and abilities to the optimum)

The implications of this theory for the bilingual-multicultural child are that the child cannot develop to the point of self-actualizing unless her/his basic needs (physiological, security, etc.) have been met. The child may feel a lack of security (need number 2) in a strange place, where the

language is different. The child may never develop a feeling that s/he belongs (need number 3) if her/his language and culture are not accepted and valued.

## Conclusions

Thus, all four theories of child or human development have important implications that support the need for bilingual-multicultural programs for young children. In conclusion, four principles appear to cut across these developmental theories and have specific implications for people working with young bilingual-multicultural children:

1. There is a sequence to the developmental process. Certain things precede others. Development generally proceeds from gross to fine, simple to complex, familiar to unfamiliar.

2. Language (non-verbal as well as verbal) is an important medium through which young children develop concepts, feelings, ideas, and abilities. Therefore, it is important to help the child use and further develop the language(s) s/he brings to school.

3. All learning is both affective and cognitive. How a child feels about what is being learned or expected of her/him influences how well s/he learns. If a child cannot find something familiar in what is expected of her/him, s/he will be unable to achieve.

4. Providing an equal educational opportunity does not mean giving each child the same treatment.

Young bilingual-multicultural children need bilingual-multicultural programs in order to develop to their full potential. They also need the equal educational opportunities to which they are legally and ethically entitled.

# EARLY CHILDHOOD THEORIES AND THE BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL CHILD

Gloria Zamora, Ph.D.

Guiding the growth, development, and learning of children during their most formative years is a tremendous responsibility. It is a responsibility that excites us, challenges us, and even, sometimes, frightens me.

Early childhood education is exciting because of the nature of children. They are so wondrous, so eager to get into everything--eager to explore and learn--eager to find out the "how" and "why" of everything. This provides us with a challenge to create stimulating learning environments appropriate to the developmental needs of young children. We are challenged daily to answer children's often probing and difficult questions; we are challenged to individualize instruction to meet differing needs; we are challenged to protect the rights of children to grow and learn in a loving, caring, safe environment.

In more recent times we have been faced with another challenge--the challenge to provide an equal opportunity for all children to have a "Head Start" on learning. Because we know that equal treatment (e.g., facilities, books, materials) does not mean equal educational opportunity, we have been challenged to change the methods, materials and languages that we have traditionally relied upon. And change often causes fear. We may feel frightened and insecure because we do not fully understand why we are being asked to change the things that we already know so well and feel so comfortable with.

One of the major and most exciting changes to arrive upon the recent American educational scene has been the development of bilingual education programs. It is a change that has caused fear, over-reaction, and anger; it is an educational process about which many people have gross misconceptions.

But bilingual education, when properly implemented, is a pedogogically sound approach designed, primarily, to meet the needs of children of limited English language skills. The soundness of this approach can be clearly supported by analyzing the implications of child development principles, psychological theory, and learning theory. In other words, if we take what we know about child development, if we take what we know about the needs of children, if we take what we know about how children learn, the implications of these theoretical positions clearly point to the need for bilingual education for children of limited English language skills.

## Child Development Principles

Let us briefly analyze a few of the major, well-known principles of child development.

Principle 1. Development is influenced by both heredity and environment.

Implications: Children are born with certain capacities for learning which can be stretched like rubber bands. The kind of home, school, and community environment and the quality

of the interactions with the people in that environment determines how far those innate capacities can be stretched. Our challenge is to provide nurturing, interesting environments that will motivate children to learn.

Principle 2. Development follows an orderly sequence (e.g., gross to fine).

Implications: We must know the concepts, skills, and processes that children should be learning. We should also know how to arrange the learning activities in a sequence that matches the gross to fine development.

Principle 3. Development is continuous.

Implications: No specific age levels can be attached to an individual child's development. We must provide sufficient activities to allow for the child's rate of development, knowing that there may be as many variations in development as there are children.

Principle 4. There is a great deal of variability among individuals.

Implications: The knowledge that children develop at different rates in different areas (e.g., motor skills, cognitive skills, personal/socialization skills) implies that we know how to assess levels of development in the skill and content areas in order to make appropriate (matching) instructional decisions for each child.

Principle 5. Development proceeds in stages.

Implications: Longitudinal observations of young children by Jean Piaget and others leads us to conclude that children go through stages of development. This has implications for the learning activities we provide. Apparently, concrete (real) experiences produce faster and better learning in early stages. That is, we will get better and possibly more long-lasting learning if learning activities are sequenced from concrete to abstract.

## Psychological Theory

An analysis of Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of needs (Maslow, 1954) clearly supports the need for bilingual/multicultural education. Maslow theorizes that self-actualization, the process of becoming everything that one is capable of becoming, is blocked, if more basic needs are not met. Thus, providing a learning environment that is psychologically safe, where each child is loved and esteemed, implies that we are accepting of each child's language and culture. Also, providing instruction in the child's dominant language increases academic achievement which enhances the development of a positive self-concept--a necessary ingredient for self-actualization.

## Learning Theories

From the voluminous works of Jean Piaget, Jerome Bruner, Robert Gagne, and others, we glean that learning is a sequential process. Gagne maintains

that the teachers responsibility is to arrange learning in an appropriate sequence--from simple to complex. Further, J. McVicker Hunt says that in order for learning to take place, the appropriate match must be made between the child and the curriculum.

All of these positions are powerful arguments that clearly support a rationale for bilingual-multicultural education. Making "appropriate matches" implies that we know:

a. what to teach
b. how to sequence the learning
c. how to diagnose
d. how to individualize instruction

For children whose dominant language is other than English, the only way to "make the match" is to teach new concepts and skills in the familiar language; the other side of the bilingual education coin is to help each child develop the basic English language skills.

## Conclusion

We now have research evidence that supports the effectiveness of bilingual education. Data indicates that "...student achievement in English has risen to or above national norms, while the students have additionally acquired skills in their native language. The conclusion is reached that a quality bilingual education program can be effective in meeting the goals of equal educational opportunity for minority language children, and if a program is not doing so, something is wrong with the program..." (Troike, 1978, p.i.).

Children--all children--have the right to an equal educational opportunity. Equal treatment does not mean equal opportunity. In this, the International Year of the Child, let us renew our commitment to children's rights to a quality education. Children have only those rights which we choose to protect for them. Bilingual/multicultural education is a way to insure equal educational opportunity and give children of limited English proficiency a Head Start towards future academic and personal success.

# BILINGUALISM: A DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLINGUISTIC APPROACH

Eugene E. Garcia, Ph.D.

The issues surrounding bilingualism are of specific interest to a large segment of this nation's population (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1974), and of general interest to those individuals studying the general phenomenon of language acquisition (McNeil, 1966). Other reviews of bilingualism have dealt with the definition of bilingualism, amount of linguistic overlap, linguistic "interference" and theoretical issues related to each of these areas (see MacNamara, 1967; Riegel, 1968; and Vildomec, 1971). For the past ten years, numerous educationally related research and program development efforts have been initiated. An important aspect of this development has been the emphasis placed on developing models relevant to the formal teaching (and learning) of more than one language (Distribution Center for Bilingual-Bicultural Education, 1974). The purpose of the present discussion is to deal with some of these same issues in light of more recent theoretical research and applied information specific to linguistic development in young bilingual children. Therefore, this discussion should (a) serve as an update from earlier reviews in this area, (b) provide some functional information to those persons concerned with early childhood bilingualism, and (c) elucidate certain researchable areas which are in need of immediate attention in the context of bilingual acquisition. I will emphasize data related to bilingual acquisition on Mexican-American children, with specific references to our own work in this area. I will also direct my discussion to the area of "environmental assistance variables" which our data suggest are important.

As one searches for a comprehensive definition of bilingualism, a continuum of definitional attempts unfolds. On one end of this continuum are general definitions such as "the practice of alternately using two languages" (Weinrich, 1953), or "knowledge of two languages" (Haugen, 1972). At the other end of this continuum are the operational definitions common to the field of experimental psychology ("subjects answered positively to questions concerning their use of two languages"; "subjects scored 90% correct on a standardized test of language proficiency in each language"; etc.). Regardless of the definition adopted for any empirical or theoretical treatment of bilingualism, it goes without emphasizing that "bilinguals" come in a variety of linguistic shapes and forms. Therefore, any definition worthy of consideration must address this built-in linguistic diversity. But to consider only linguistic parameters would be an error. Thorough definitions of bilingualism must additionally consider cognitive and social domains; language or languages must be acquired, but achieve maturity and use within definable social contexts.

The following discussion will attempt to introduce a definition relevant to bilingual acquisition during early childhood. In doing so, early childhood bilingualism will necessarily be defined with considerations of linguistic, social, psychological and, to some extent, physiological issues in mind. There is little doubt that bilingualism cannot presently be defined to the satisfaction of the theorist, researcher, or educator, but an attempt is

necessary here on pure communicative grounds. In perceiving quite well that I will fail to meet all demands placed on this definition, might I offer the entire subject matter of this discussion as a definition of sorts.

> Early childhood bilingualism defined: The term bilingualism here suggests the simultaneous acquisition of two or more languages during the first five years of life. This definition utilizes the traditional use of the term language and requires the following conditions:
>
> (a) Children are able to comprehend and/or produce some aspects of each language beyond the ability to discriminate that either one language or another is being spoken. The intent of this precondition is to confer the term bilingual to children who can handle other than the most basic attributes of symbolic communication [that one set of symbols (languages) is the same or different than another].
>
> (b) Children are exposed "naturally" to the two systems of languages as they are used in the form of social interaction. This condition requires a substantive bilingual environment in the location of the child's first five years of life. In many cases this exposure comes from within a traditional nuclear family network, but this need not be the case (relatives, visitors, second language schooling, and extended visits to foreign countries are examples of alternative environments).

It is therefore these combined conditions which define the present population of interest. It is clear from this definition that an attempt is made to include both the child's linguistic abilities in conjunction with his social environment. An idealized definition follows from the conditions stated above: A child prior to the age of five is able to function in two languages at some level of social interaction. In this way, the concentration on linguistic social competence redefines the traditional linguistic-only base of previous definitions. It is the more detailed working definition with its defining conditions which will be of use in further discussions of theoretical, empirical and educational issues, and which identifies the primary class of bilinguals of interest in the remainder of this manuscript.

Prior to leaving this definition in search of meaningful data, let us consider briefly each of the conditions identified as important. Linguistically, it is necessary to borrow from theoretical and empirical work done in "single" or native language acquisition. In doing so, the primary features of language are placed in a three dimensional perspective. That is, each language can be characterized by phonology, lexicon, morphology, syntax and semantics. In addition, each of these categories can be considered at receptive (ability to understand) and expressive (ability to speak) levels. Therefore, acquisition on the part of the child must consider the development of each of these segmented features. But as the second condition of the previous definition implies, these linguistic attributes are imbedded in a social (cultural) milieu (environ). Therefore, it is imperative to consider the social context as it related to social variables which influence both acquisition and use of a bilingual repertoire.

The linguistic and social variables considered above can be related to any bilingual; yet, our concern here is with early childhood bilingualism. Two important differences are related to the meaningful distinction between this form of bilingualism and others. First, early childhood is characterized, traditionally, as a time of considerable physiological transformation. Of special interest here is the development of neurostructures, which are related to language acquisition. As Jacobson (1976) suggests, "Formal linguistic analysis, divorced from its biological substrates, is unlikely to be a profitable approach to the problem of how the brain generates language, and purely psychological approaches to that problem are equally unlikely to succeed." This is certainly a strong case for a keen awareness of physiological variables as they relate to early language acquisition in general, and to the task of bilingual acquisition in particular. Unfortunately, the dependency of this work on brain dysfunction and the unavailability of an experimental technology for investigating causal relationships between cerebral development and language acquisition leaves us with little more than an awareness of possible interrelationships:

> "The task of finding causal relationships between neurobiology and language has met with serious difficulties. Cerebral localizations of language function, although a necessary preliminary step, falls short of a neurophysiological explication of language. If our expectations include such an explication, we have to admit that little progress has been made toward its realization. Indeed, it is not yet possible to describe any complex type of behavior in terms of a program of neural events, and many decades will pass before the neurophysiological mechanisms of cognitive process in men are understood." (Jacobson, 1976, pp. 105-106.)

Therefore, although it is incumbant for us to be aware and empirically concerned with the physiology of early childhood bilingualism, we are left to center only on the linguistic, social and psychological aspects of the phenomenon. This may not be the case in the near future.

It is the psychological aspects of bilingualism which is yet left untreated in the above discussion. It is this aspect of bilingualism in early childhood which further differentiates its character from other forms of bilingualism not considered in our earlier definition. A specific example is the case of second language acquisition. Typically, this effort is begun after near complete development of the native language. But early childhood bilingualism takes place during the same temporal period of native language development in monolinguals. This temporal period is marked by parallel development within cognitive domains and is a time of cognitive growth. Therefore, the relationship between bilingual development and cognitive development must be considered.

Recent information in the cognitive growth area (spurred mostly by Piaget) has suggested an interactive relationship between cognitive structures and language acquisition (Brown, 1973). A similar interactive relationship must be considered for bilingual development during early childhood. Although direct research in this area is only beginning to emerge, its theoretical

relevance has been historically noted (Leopold, 1953). Ervin-Tripp summarizes some of the major differences, considered psychological, between children and adults as they relate to language acquisition.

a. Children show a greater readiness to learn the language of their contemporaries in a new linguistic environment.

b. Children enjoy rote memorization, while adults prefer solving intellectual problems.

c. Adults emphasize the content of language, often neglecting its formal system.

d. Children are more perceptive to the sounds of language, adults to its meaning.

e. Children relate speech more to the immediate context.

f. Children usually learn new words through sensory activity, adults in a purely verbal context.

g. Children make linguistic abstractions--learn about structures never directly presented to them, but adults have a greater capacity to remember stated grammatical rules.

h. Children seem less subject to interference from their native systems than are adults.

In summary then, I have presented a definition of bilingualism specific to early childhood. It is a definition considerate of more than pure linguistic features. Instead it is concerned with traditional linguistic features in concert with social, psychological and, to some extent, physiological parameters. Additionally, although these parameters have been discussed separately (and will be divided along these same lines in the discussion which follows), they must not be seen as static entities. Instead, it is important to view them within an interactive perspective such that their treatment theoretically, empirically, or educationally cannot be totally separated. The impact of each variable influencing bilingualism in early childhood must be evaluated within this perspective. It is this non-static model which will be of benefit in a clearer understanding of early childhood bilingualism.

## Bilingual Development

It is common for an adult bilingual to be considered "educated" (Macky, 1967). But, as Haugen (1972) indicates, the converse may also be true. Independent of the social perceptions of bilingualism, it is clear that a child can and does learn more than one linguistic communicative form of many societies throughout the world. Sorenson (1967) describes the acquisition of three to four languages by young children who live in the Northwest Amazon region of South America. Although the Tukano tribal language serves as the *lingua franca* in the area, there continues to exist some 25 clearly distinguishable linguistic groups in this Brazilian-Columbian border region. In

this country, Skrabanek (1970) reports the continued acquisition and support of both English and Spanish language systems among young preschool children of our own Southwest for the last hundred years, with no indication that this phenomenon will be disrupted. Unfortunately, little is known either descriptively or causally about the process of this linguistic development, although several studies tackled this phenomenon with linguistic description as their primary goal.

One of the first systematic investigations of bilingual acquisition in young children was reported by Leopold (1939, 1947, 1949a, 1949b). This author set out to study the "simultaneous" acquisition of English and German in his own daughter. These descriptive reports indicate that although the subject was exposed to both languages during infancy, she seemed to weld both languages into one system during initial language production periods. Language production during later periods (ages 2.1 - 2.6) indicated that the use of English and German grammatical forms developed independently.

More recently, Padilla and Leibman (1975) report the longitudinal analysis of Spanish-English acquisition in two three-year-old bilingual children. These researchers followed the model of Brown (1973) in recording linguistic interactions of these children over a five-month period. By an analysis of several dependent linguistic variables (phonological, grammatical, syntactic and semantic characteristics) over this time period they observed gains in both languages, although several English forms were in evidence, while similar Spanish forms were not. They also report the differentiation of linguistic systems at phonological, lexical, and syntactic levels. They conclude:

> "The appropriate use of both languages even in mixed utterances was evident; that is, correct word order was preserved. For example, there were no occurrences of "raining está" or "a es baby", but there was evidence for such utterances as "está raining" and "es a baby". There was also absence of the redundance of words in mixed utterances, as well as the absence of unnecessary words which might tend to confuse meaning." (page 51)

Our own developmental data is relevant here. Following bilingual children for 12 months and comparing these children to a matched group of monolingual controls, the following results were evident:

1. Acquisition of both Spanish and English was evident at complex morphological and syntactic levels.

2. Acquisition of English was more advanced than Spanish; children were "unequally" bilingual.

3. There was no significant difference between bilingual children and monolingual match controls on English language measures.

On a more global scale, preliminary evaluation of some 600 bilingual children nationally also suggests a simultaneous developmental phenomenon. Moreover, this data suggests differing trends for Spanish than English, which were consistent across regional boundries and rural/urban status. That is,

for Spanish an increase in MLU is observed in four- and five-year-olds, with a consistent drop at the six-year-old level. For English, a steady increase was observed for this same MLU measure across these same age ranges.

## Linguistic Input and Social Context

As Riegel (1968) suggests, any chronological record of the child's linguistic output coupled with linguistic input information would allow an important correlational analysis of language development. Although this extensive information remains unavailable, some systematic semblance of this type of data gathering is becoming available for monolingual English children (Brown and Fraser, 1963; Schacter, Kirshner, Klips, Friedricks, Sanders, 1974). Unfortunately, little information of this calibre is available for young bilingual children.

Although this absence of empirical data is theoretically crippling, some cautious notions of bilingual input seems justifiable. If one considers the eventual bilingual input product, it seems appropriate to suggest that some percentage of the child's linguistic information is in one language and some other percentage is in a second language. One might tie the acquisition of either language to the general theoretical notion of "degree of linguistic input". Mathematically, the extent of bilingualism would be directly related to the proportion of language information made available.

This simple relationship must be qualified. Again, some of our data is useful here in advancing this notion. An analysis of the input of Spanish and English of the bilingual children under study produced the following perplexing results:

1. Mother language directed toward the child and child language directed at the mother was predominantly in Spanish.

2. Sibling language directed to the child and child language directed to the sibling was predominantly in English.

3. Few instances of language switching was observed.

This form of data suggest that useful accounts of early childhood bilingualism must, therefore, take into consideration more than the linguistic nature of the child's language. Attention must be paid to the influence of powerful environmental variables associated with the quality and quantity of linguistic input for each language. This type of analysis should allow a more complete relationship to be drawn between the linguistic environments of the child and bilingual development.

## Language Transfer

When referring to the interactive phenomenon between languages of the bilingual, the term "interference" is often used. This term has gained multiple meanings, as is shown by its gain of various modifiers: "linguistic

interference", "psychological interference", and "educational interference" (Saville and Troike, 1971).

This interactive process might be considered both general and specific in nature. That is, it is possible that the requirements imposed on a child with respect to multilingual acquisition would lead to a general linguistic lag, compared to a child whose communicative requirements center on one distinct language. Carrow's (1971, 1972) work is relevant to this notion of general "interference". Measures across languages indicated that English outdistanced Spanish for bilingual children, and that English for these same bilinguals was lower than English for monolingual age controls. This English lag was evident during early ages (3-5 years), but not at later ages (6-7 years). Although this data suggests a possible causal relationship between bilingualism and the initial "rate" of language acquisition, it is far from conclusive. In fact, Padilla and Liebman (1975) report contradictory evidence. Their analysis of two three-year-old bilingual children's linguistic development suggest no general language lag in either language. By comparing these subjects' utterances to those reported by Gonzalez (1970) for monolingual Spanish children they were able to conclude:

> "There is no evidence in the language samples that might suggest an overall reduced or slower rate of language growth for the bilingual children of this study (as compared to monolingual children of other studies)." (page 51)

Because the notion of a general lag does not consider the possible importance of specific language form, similarities and differences, it does not seem to hold much promise for identifying important levels of interaction operating during bilingual acquisition. Therefore, a more specific analysis of linguistic interaction which considers such differences and similarities is necessary.

Typical evidence of the "interference" phenomenon in bilingual children is taken from naturalistic language samples. As Ervin-Tripp (1973) suggests, "interference" in these samples is exemplified by performance errors in the learner's linguistic system as they relate to a contrastive analysis of both languages involved. (Dulay and Burt (1972) have also suggested an error-analysis methodology.) Padilla and Liebman's (1975) recent longitudinal work has addressed the issue of transfer through the analysis of linguistic errors. They were able to conclude that after an initial, short, undifferentiated phase (prior to 2.5 years), bilingual children they observed tended to keep languages, Spanish and English, separate. More recent error-analysis data allows Padilla (1976) to conclude that:

> "Children reared in bilingual environments learn to differentiate their two linguistic systems relatively early. When linguistic interactions do occur there may be several possible explanations, ranging from lack of familiarity with the word in one language to the child's acquisition of discourse strategies which demand a switch in language." (page 11)

This type of investigation requires one major assumption: Any "interference" sample is causally related to an interaction effect of the two identified

languages. Unfortunately, this assumption is in need of empirical verification. For instance, linguistic observations of a young child may produce the following utterances: "Did you see ese carro?", or "El boy is going with us." Given our previous guide, each of these might be considered an example of "interference". Yet, a closer analysis of the child's total input system might indicate that this type of linguistic format is his only model (it is not a function of one of the child's languages acting upon the other). Therefore, it would seem totally inappropriate to consider these utterances forms of or symptoms of "interference".

Given the above methodological problems, it would seem more appropriate to consider the interactive nature of languages for the bilingual as linguistic transfer or generalization, instead of "interference". Transfer has traditionally been used to indicate the effects of previous training experiences on present training experiences as it relates to specific learning tasks. Ellis (1972) summarized five factors which influence the transfer of learning between tasks: (1) task similarity, (2) time interval between tasks, (3) degree of original learning, (4) variety of previously learned tasks, and (5) task difficulty. With respect to bilingual acquisition, research concentrating on the transfer of learning effect must consider more than the general error productions of children as they related to a general contrastive analysis of the two languages presumed to be involved. Additionally, this transfer analysis must be made available in both directions. The form of the question might be as follows: "How does present language learning effect new language learning, and how does new language learning effect previous language learning forms?" This question must be addressed across each language, both from a positive and negative perspective. This strategy requires knowledge of present structures in each language, then tracking these and future language change so as to make a correlational analysis available for inspection.

Since it may be difficult to assess all variables, it may be of experimental importance to consider the interactive effects of bilingualism during acquisition more specifically. To do so means investigating non-manipulated dependent variable changes to manipulated independent variable changes. Therefore, this phenomenon would concentrate on those changes in one language which occur as a function of changes in the second language. For research purposes, this conceptualization calls for an experimental strategy requiring the manipulation of one language while concomitantly measuring the effect of that change on the second language. This methodology is best exemplified by our own work. These series of studies investigated the effect of Spanish language acquisition on already existing English language forms with young (3-4 year old) children who came from bilingual home environments. Subjects were children who exemplified both receptive and expressive abilities of specific prepositional ability in one language ($L_1$), but not in the other ($L_2$). In one such study which emphasized $L_2$ training alone, as Spanish prepositional expression was acquired correct English prepositional use declined. In a second study, which emphasized $L_2$ training in conjunction with $L_1$ maintenance, new prepositions were acquired without any corresponding decrease in $L_1$. This experimentally manipulated influence of linguistic modes (Spanish and English) at the expressive level during acquisition exemplifies a methodological format with great promise for future research. Such research would more clearly point out causal relationships.

## Conclusion

As is obvious, these studies allow only segmented relationships to be identified. Of course, the challenge facing the study of early childhood bilingualism is the same as that facing psychology as a whole: identifying causal relationships. Therefore, instead of continuing only to monitor linguistic or cognitive skills of bilinguals, or comparing these to monolinguals, additional methodology is called for. In this case, specific bilingual qualities must be initially monitored, then changed experimentally while concomitant changes in linguistic and/or social functioning are assessed. This approach would go hand in hand with naturalistic, linguistic and social observations, and would allow specific causal relationships to be identified. Most importantly, linguistic, social and psychological influences must be placed in an interactive framework if any clear general understanding of early childhood bilingualism is to become a reality.

REFERENCES, Eugene Garcia Presentation


Brown, R.A. A first language: The early stages. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Brown, R., & Bellugi, U. Three processes in the acquisition of syntax. Harvard Educational Review, 1964, 34, 133-151.

Carrow, E. Comprehension of English and Spanish by Preschool Mexican-American Children. Modern Language Journal, 1971, 55, 299, 306.

Carrow, E. Auditory comprehension of English by monolingual and bilingual preschool children. Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 1972, 15, 407-412.

Dulay, H.C., & Burt, M.K. Goofing: An indication of children's second language learning strategies. Language Learning, 1972, 22, 235-252.

Dulay, H.C., & Burt, M.K. Should we teach children syntax. Language Learning, 1973, 23, 245-258.

Ellis, H.C. Fundamentals of human learning and cognition. Dubuque, Iowa: W.C. Brown Co., 1972.

Ervin-Tripp, S. Language Acquisition and Communicative Choice. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1973.

Ervin, S.M., & Osgood, C. Language learning and bilingualism. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, 23, 29-38.

Gonzalez, G. The acquisition of Spanish grammar by native Spanish speakers. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1970.

Gumperz, J.J., & Hernandez, E. Bilingualism, bidialectualism, and classroom instruction. In D.R. Cazden, et al (Eds.), Functions of Language in the Classroom. New York: Teacher College Press, 1972.

Leopold, W.F. Speech development of a bilingual child: A linguist's record. Vol. I, Vocabulary growth in the first two years. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1947.

Leopold, W.F. Speech development of a bilingual child: A linguist's record. Vol. IV, Diary from age two. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1949(b).

Mackey, W.F. The description of bilingualism. Canadian Journal of Linguistics, 1962, 7, 51-58.

McNeil, D. Developmental Psycholinguistics. In Frank Smith and George Miller (Eds.), The genesis of language: A psycholinguistic approach. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1966, 15-84.

## REFERENCES
(Garcia, p. 2)


MacNamara, J. Bilingualism in the modern world. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23, 1-7.

MacNamara, J. The bilingual's linguistic performance--A psychological overview. The Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 8, 58-77.

Padilla, A. Child bilingualism: Insights to issues. In J. Martinez (Ed.), Chicano Psychology, Academic Press (In press, 1976).

Padilla, A.M., & Liebman, E. Language acquisition in the bilingual child. The bilingual review/La revista bilingüe, 1975, 2, 34-55.

Riegel, K.F. Some theoretical considerations of bilingual development. Psychological Bulletin, 1968, 70, 647-670.

Saville, M.R. Interference phenomenon in language teaching: Their nature, extent, and significance in the acquisition of standard English. Elementary English, 1971, March, 396-405.

Saville, M.R., & Troike, R.C. A handbook of bilingual education. Washington, D.C.: TESOL, 1971.

Skrabanek, R.L. Language maintenance among Mexican-Americans. International Journal of Comparative Sociology, 1970, 11, 272-282.

Schacter, F.F., Kirshner, D., Klips, B., Friedricks, M., & Sanders, K. Everyday preschool interpersonal speech usage: Methodological, developmental and sociolinguistic studies. Monographs of Society for Research in Child Development, 1974, 39.

Sorensen, A.P. Multilingualism in the Northwest Amazon. American Anthropologist, 1967, 69, 670-684.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Toward quality education for Mexican Americans: Report IV: Mexican American education study. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1974.

Vildomec, V. Multilingualism. Leyden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1971.

Weinrich, U. Languages in Contact. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York, 1953.

# BILINGUAL/MULTICULTURAL CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION

## [CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT]

## ¡ALERTA!
## CURRICULUM MODEL

Leslie Williams, Ed.D.

I appreciate the opportunity to be here today, to share with you some of the excitement and thoughts, measures and realities that have gone into the creation of another of the curriculum models.

The purpose of this presentation is to discuss the basic direction and content of the ¡ALERTA! Preschool Curriculum. In the description, reference will be made to points of comparison and contrast among elements of the approaches that others of the curriculum developers have devised. We welcome that comparison because we do not see ourselves as competing with the other developers in our efforts. We recognize that different groups for whom bilingualism and multiculturalism are living realities have different interests and needs; and for that reason, I think it is good for the people involved to examine all of the models before deciding to use a particular one of them.

The presentation is divided into three parts. In the first part are general remarks regarding the nature of the curriculum itself, the philosophy behind it, and the directions the program takes. The second part elaborates on the information to be shown in the slide presentation, with reference to the materials which are now available to programs interested in adopting the model. The third part consists of (the narrative of) a slide presentation illustrating some of the principles previously discussed.

I will first point out some of the similarities between ¡ALERTA!'s approach and the approaches in the other three curriculum models. Some of the comparisons may be obvious, but they are no less important because of that.

Like the other models, ¡ALERTA! is both bilingual and multicultural in orientation. The curriculum addresses the Head Start Performance Standards as the other models do. It also pays careful attention to the CDA competency areas, so that persons participating in this model will be well on the road to CDA credentialling, while persons already possessing a CDA credential should feel at home with the program. Still another similarity is the fact that we do use as a part of our language teaching strategy, natural language learning techniques very like those mentioned in the presentation of the High Scope Model. We also use a more structured language learning approach, as a balance, in a manner similar to AMANECER's "Circle Time".

Like the two models presented earlier in the conference, we are concerned about the program's ability to maintain itself once the program developers have removed themselves entirely from the scene of action. Recognizing that we have a short tenure in the role of curriculum developers, we are aware that the real test will be the program's ability to be transmitted through its published materials.

These are a few of the parameters that ¡ALERTA! has in common with the other models. There are, however, many features which are distinctive and characteristic of ¡ALERTA! alone. First, in the construction of our curriculum

we drew upon particular circumstances, environments, and patterns of traditions that are common to the East Coast of the United States, to populations from the rural southern part of the United States, and to populations from the Caribbean and South American. Because we have had such widely varied groups of people participating in the development of the program, our definition of multiculturalism may be more wide ranging than that which has been found in other areas of the country. This does not mean, however, the program is limited in use to the East Coast. The model is also a process approach, one in which there is constant recognition of the distinctive characteristics of the region where it is being used. It can be easily adapted to other areas of the country.

A difference from the other models, as I perceive it, is the degree to which we use the community as a resource, making, in a sense, the community a classroom. Our children spend a lot of time outside in the community, walking, talking, and learning.

New York has a diverse population. This put a special kind of requirement on us in developing the program because, very clearly, any Head Start center that was operating would draw upon this rich mixture. In the initial classroom used we had Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Dominicans, Hondurans, Ecuadorians, Peruvians, African-American children from the rural South, inner city children whose parents have been living in the city for generations, Jamaicans, and Trinidadians. They all became a part of the program.

Another factor affecting the population which is important to understand might not be intuitively obvious. We experience strong migration patterns. Many of the people from the Hispanic populations mentioned above are involved in what is known as the "shuttle migration". People periodically go back to their homeland in order to visit relatives, to engage in a particular kind of work, or because of the need to be back home . . . which is very strong. For this reason, we will have children starting in Head Start programs in September who two months later will be gone. They might reappear in one of the other centers four months after that. Thus, there are certain similarities between our situation and that of migrant programs.

We became acutely aware of the fact that during these three or four months that the children were gone they were gaining a wealth of experiences. They were coming back to us each time rich, and it became extremely important for us to tap that experience and make it a part of the program.

What we were given in children who were frequent travelers were two completely different frames of reference. Many of the children who came to our programs came from rural settings (in the Islands, in the southern part of the U.S.) into New York, which is about as urban as one can imagine. The children, thus had two frames of reference that were very real, vital and extremely important to take into account. To neglect one in the service of the other was doing the children an injustice. In one sense, it made our lives more difficult because we had to figure out what all those frames of reference were. In another sense it made our lives easier because there was so much resource material to tap. We never ran out of material.

Another difference between us and other models had to do with our understanding of the source of the curriculum. We were originally characterized as the "Child Initiated Model", but that label had a connotation which has led to

some misunderstandings. Our day is not totally child initiated. During a large portion of the day, the children do select their own activities; but there is also a portion of the day which is directed by adults. These two types of activity are in balance with each other. However, there is some truth to that characterization, in that we understand the source of the curriculum as originating from a deep structure that the child brings with him/her to the center. By the "deep structure" I am referring both to the child development principles of the sort that Gloria Zamora was sharing with us earlier, and also to theories of learning. This aspect of our curriculum is reflected in the material we have developed, the emphasis we have put on the children's immediate environment, and in the manner in which we have interacted with staff and with parents in the training program which accompanies the program.

A further distinctive feature lies in our understanding of the nature of language learning. We do believe that, in order to acquire a second language well, the first language must be as completely developed and extended as possible for each individual. We believe that it is important to use the experience that children bring with them both in expanding that first language and in developing the second. We are careful, however, not to repeat an activity using the same materials for the first language development and the second language acquisitions because of the possibility of boredom. We use the same concepts that have been developed and expanded previously in the first language and develop an entirely new activity to provide vocabulary and phrases for those concepts in the second language. The precise teaching strategies used vary depending on whether the first or second language is being addressed.

We have arrived at a particular balance between child-initiated work and teacher-directed work as the result of extensive observations during the development of the curriculum.

The language learning aspect of ¡ALERTA! has sometimes been misunderstood. Therefore, I wish to clarify our position at the outset. We do not see language lessons as something separate from other aspects of the curriculum. We do have small group sessions in which children are divided according to preferred language and degree of bilingualism (insofar as we are able to determine that degree). The content of these sessions could involve math, science, or other content focus. Activities involve language, not for its own sake, but as a vehicle, fully integrated with all other types of learning.

As have other models, we have produced a staff training program for centers wishing to adopt the curriculum. Centers are provided with a complete set of workshop plans which, again, are flexible enough so that people can vary them according to individual circumstances. We also have a parent workshop series, "Words for Administrators" and an "Annotated Bibliography".

The support or training materials prepare staff to work with all the parts making up the total program, namely: (1) use of the life experience that the children bring with them into the classroom from all the frames of reference that are available to them; (2) use of goals and objectives for the children's learning which are derived from observation of the children and from the community of which they are a part; (3) preparation of a learning environment (reflected in the total center); (4) selection and design of learning activities (both the activities that are directed by adults and the activities which are

designed and carried out by the children); (5) use of particular teaching styles or strategies for language learning; and (6) use of an underlying process of assessment and planning through which teachers and parents involved in the program continue to shape the program to the children's interests, strengths, and basic human needs.

The following is a portion of the narrative accompanying the slide presentation shown.

The ¡ALERTA! program is both bilingual and multicultural in orientation. To us, "bilingual" means that children from two primary language groups learn each others' language at the same time as they continue to develop and refine their mother tongue. By "multicultural" we are referring both to the contact between diverse cultural groups in the classroom setting and to the respect and recognition given to each child's contribution to a culturally plural society. One of the differences between our program and other programs which characterize themselves as bilingual in the New York City area is that in those programs the emphasis has been on the Spanish-speaking children's learning English. In our program it is a two-way interaction. Equal emphasis is given to English-speaking children's learning of Spanish and Spanish-speaking children's learning of English.

The ¡ALERTA! program was originally developed over a three-year period as part of the Head Start Strategy of Spanish-speaking Children. An expressed purpose of the program's development was to provide an alternative early childhood program for bilingual children which would reflect the cultural configuration of the urban centers of the East Coast.

¡ALERTA! began as a result of intense interaction between the staff at three participating Head Start centers, the parents of children at those centers, an Advisory Board composed of community members, and other persons with expertise in fields related to the projects, representatives from receiving schools, and a staff of early childhood educators from Teachers College, Columbia University. The typical settings in which the program was first field tested and implemented varied from Head Start classrooms located in community centers to Head Start Centers operating in churches or other such facilities in the heart of the city.

It was considered important by the program developers that the setting be typical of those in which the program might be implemented in the future. We were working with preexisting Head Start programs, and staff that had been hired before the program was initiated.

The curriculum was derived, in part, through a series of intensive observations. There were two types of observations. The first involved the capabilities children displayed at the centers, including such aspects as continuing growth in their ability to deal with their emotions, their experimenting with objects and ideas, their approaches to problem solving situations, and their tendencies toward working constructively as members of a group. Secondly, observations were made in the community in which the participating centers were located, with attention to the children's exposure to Spanish and English, their everyday environment, identification of recreation centers used by the community members, evidence of the co-existence of several different

cultures within a single neighborhood, and identification of community resources which could be drawn upon in program planning.

The observations and interactions were related to the Head Start goals and Performance Standards and to basic understandings of how young children learn which came from the literature on child development.

Added to these understandings was our belief that self-images and self-esteem are closely tied to respect accorded to cultures in the educational setting. Aspects of culture which reflect the direct experience of children in the program are integrated into the daily lives in the classroom.

The traditions of the various groups represented at the center are frequently reflected in the center. Figures familiar to the children became integral elements of some play situations. Art forms characteristic of the cultures of the children in the center, along with examples of the children's own work, are used to decorate the rooms.

In a multicultural environment such as New York and other large urban centers, activities need to incorporate not only the cultural traditions children bring to the center, but elements from the urban setting itself. One of the things we felt had been overlooked in many programs was the active use of the children's immediate surroundings.

A "curriculum" in the larger sense of the word is everything that goes on in the child's life. This definition implies that a curriculum cannot be put once and for all into one specific set of activities, but must be the continuing creation of teachers, parents, and community members who observe, draw from, and build upon the child's actual world. This notion underlies the approach taken in the ¡ALERTA! program.

¡ALERTA! recognizes the importance of careful planning and preparation. Through weekly plans and daily expansions of those plans, teaching teams coordinate observations of the children and choices of goals and the objectives taken from the curriculum with the cultural and environmental experience the children bring with them into the classroom.

This coordination is seen in two major spheres of activity: (1) in the preparation of the classroom environment to facilitate child initiated work, and (2) in the use of specific teaching strategies in adult directed activity periods.

Following the Head Start Performance Standards, each classroom is divided into interest areas, such as the block area, the dramatic play area, the sand and water area, etc. Insofar as is feasible, each area is furnished with material reflecting the bilingual, multicultural orientation of the program. This reflection is seen in the books made available, in the manipulatives presented for the children's use, in the records and games, in the musical instruments that are available, and in other common objectives which have cultural significance. Attention is also given to the children's daily experiences in the classroom in materials such as language experience books. Photographs are used to record a typical day's work and arranged in sequence on the pages of a blank notebook. Space is left for use by the children in writing stories

about the picture. As noted previously, the urban environment is also considered in materials construction and selection. And books are sought which accurately present urban images.

Adult directed activities may be conducted with individuals or with small groups. Some types of activities, such as those involving music and movement, can be carried out involving large groups.

Sample lesson plans for adult directed work are provided as points of departure for programs adopting the model. It is expected, however, that the Head Start staff members will themselves become engaged in the creation of additional activities particularly suited to their own regions and populations.

Closely linked to both the child initiated and the adult directed learning activities are the recommended teaching strategies for language learning. First language development and second language acquisition occur in part through the small-group, adult-directed sessions. Concepts are introduced first in the native language. When the concept has clearly been acquired by the child in the first language, a different activity is used to reintroduce the same concept in a second language. The small group activities are followed-up with informal contacts with the children during the child-initiated portion of the day.

Both the nature and the setting of these planned activities can vary tremendously. A distinctive feature of the ALERTA! program is its "Combination Sessions", during which members of the teaching team take turns conducting small group activities in the development of the first language or the acquisition of the second language, while their partner circulates among children as they make their own choices of activities.

A system for assessing the progress of the children within the program has been developed for use by the staff on a daily basis.

An important prerequisite for the implementation of the ¡ALERTA! program is the willingness of staff and parents to undertake training in which they review each part of the program's process. Serious acceptance of such training means that participants must be willing to set aside any preconceived idea they have about their neighborhood and look closely at experiences which actually exist.

At the heart of the ¡ALERTA! program is the child. By recognizing children not only as individuals, but as part of a group having values, an atmosphere is created which brings each child's full gifts into full play. Learning a second language, learning more about their own culture, and understanding something about the lives of persons different from themselves may thus become joyful and satisfying experiences. By doing this ¡ALERTA! will have accomplished its purpose. (End of film.)

All of the curriculum materials are in both Spanish and English. We have a manual for teachers, teaching assistants, and teachers' aids. Supplementary to this manual is a File of Sample Learning Activities and "Annotated List of Learning Materials that are Available Commercially" which contain commentaries regarding the suitability of selected materials for use in the program. In addition we have a Manual for Workshop Leaders, which can be used by

administrators, coordinators, regional training personnel, or whoever will in fact be responsible for providing or arranging training. We have a "Parent Portfolio" aimed at facilitating parent involvement. We also have a commentary for administrators, which advises on the types of interaction that we feel will bring about the continuance of the program. Finally, there are two slide presentations, one an overview of the program, and one illustrating a method of making learning materials to reflect the local environment. Both presentations are accompanied by taped narratives in English and in Spanish.

## DEVELOPING A CURRICULUM FOR BILINGUAL-MULTICULTURAL CHILDREN

Barbara G. Cox

The major focus of Ms. Cox's presentation was a description of the bilingual-bicultural preschool model developed at the University of California (Santa Cruz). Following is a summary of her presentation. This summary was prepared from a transcript of a taped recording of Ms. Cox's presentation. Rather than include the entire transcript, we have extracted and edited portions for this report.

Our mandate from ACYF was to develop a comprehensive preschool curriculum. We needed to address concept development, language development, socioemotional development and psychomotor development. We planned so that these areas could be approached from a bilingual, bicognitive, multicultural framework and would overlap and compliment each other to achieve maximum growth in all areas. We set out spending a good part of our first year observing children in Head Start Centers in California, noting their behaviors in different situations, noting which children they were talking to, which adults, observing their capabilities and skills, looking at the activities that seem to be successful for some children and unsuccessful for others, developing ideas about why that might be, observing parents in the center, other adults that came to the center, talking with parents, talking with staff, and talking with community members.

We spent part of that first year observing and getting down the ideas and descriptions of things that seem to work. We also spent part of that year throwing out things that did not work.

The second year the staff, families and children in the Head Start Center in Watsonville, California piloted the approaches, activities and materials that we ended up with at the end of Year One. At the end of that second year we had a written draft of the curriculum model that had been implemented for one year at one site. Also at the end of that year we introduced the curriculum to new (field test) sites, one in Rio Grande City, Texas and the other in Corona, California. We next spent some time at each of those two sites discussing our models, their implementation, and how the goals and objectives of the model met or were parallel or converged with the goals and objectives of the people in those communities.

We are continuing to examine our model and now we have insights into how flexible our model is and how adaptable it is. We are finalizing the model for dissemination later this year.

### Implementation Process

The first step involves assessment: assessment of language, of concept development, of all areas of psychomotor development, of learning styles of individual children and characteristics of the group or groups. This first step is a very important one involving asking questions, observing children, observing children in cross-cultural situations, observing in the community,

knowing the family, knowing the parents, getting really to know the children, seeing what children can do and know, and what they have mastered.

Then determine how to extend what a child knows. Where do I go from here? What am I going to do? This is the second step, planning how to meet the needs, or how to extend children's understanding capabilities with the resources available. Those two things, assessment and planning, together with looking at the needs of the community and the resources of your staff, of your center, in large part determines what is going to happen.

The third step is to implement the plan--to conduct the planned activities, provide the planned environment and the materials, provide opportunities for interactions and growth and learning to occur.

The fourth step was to evaluate what we had done. We tried to collect evaluation feedback, which has been one of the most valuable inputs since initial planning of the model. From this, we know that it does not work with this particular teacher, with this group of children. However, it works for this teacher over here with another group of children. As a consequence we are more able to predict adjustments that various sites or teachers will have to make in order to maximize success in using the model to meet their goals.

I would like to talk a few minutes about the materials that we have been developing. The core of the model is explained in the Teachers' Manual and Curriculum Guide. We are also finalizing a manual for trainers to use to train teachers. Sets of materials are divided into subject matter topics such as Myself, the Family, the Community--other topics like Corn, Water, Ranch Animals, Pets, Land Travel. The core of each Unit is a set of folders. For each Unit there is an Introductory folder that discusses the basic aims and objectives for that Unit and how to develop that theme to meet and extend the individual abilities of the children. There is an Index for cross-referencing that visually displays how the activities described in that Unit will help meet objectives and which skills are related to each activity. There is a Parent and Community Participation folder containing ideas for continual and meaningful parent involvement. There is an Additional Ideas folder that simply lists idea after idea related to the Unit for follow-up, modifying the Unit activities for adapting them (activities) for meeting the various needs of the children in the group. Finally, there are 12-14 activity folders per Unit for specific language and concept development goals. Inside are lists of necessary materials for each activity, step-by-step procedures, questions that you might want to ask the children to extend their language concepts. Finally, on the back are activities for second language development. Every Unit has some supplementary materials including bilingual storybooks, picture cards and felt board figure patterns. All of the sample activity plans (folders) include discussion of adaptations according to various criteria and needs, including first and second language development, children's ways and preferences for learning, and conceptual, psychomotor and socioemotional development.

Ms. Cox then presented a series of slides depicting various aspects of the model's implementation and answered questions.

# THE RELEVANCE OF CULTURE TO TEACHING AND LEARNING IN PRESCHOOL CLASSROOMS

Manuel Ramirez III, Ph.D.

The summary of Dr. Ramirez' presentation which follows was obtained from a transcript of his presentation. Some editing of the transcript was done to make the text readable. However, much of what follows reflects, verbatim, Dr. Ramirez' presentation.

The title of the talk is "The Relevance of Culture to Teaching and Learning in Preschool Classrooms". We have already heard language mentioned many times here today and we have heard something about heritage. The other major component of bilingual-bicultural education, and the one I would like to focus on today, is culture.

It has been a struggle to convince educators and social scientists to include culture not only in school classrooms, but in theories of human development as well. It has been a big struggle and it is a continuing struggle.

I would like to thank ACYF for helping us to continue our work in the areas of the relationship of culture to learning and teaching styles. But I think the people who I really have to thank are those of you who have been in Head Start for such a long time and have pushed for this over the years. You pushed for the idea that a different educational environment had to be created for children who had another culture. . . what we have referred to as cultural democracy (the idea that people have a right to remain identified with their ethnic group while they begin to learn about other groups). That people have a right to (be) bicultural or multicultural; I think that is what we are struggling for and I think this model that we have been developing will be another step in the direction of having education in the United States reflect the philosophy of cultural democracy.

Let me start, first of all, by talking a bit about how we used the concept of cognitive styles as a means of introducing culture into the classroom. I shall begin with a short history of our work and show how our research led us to move away from the traditional notions of cognitive styles that have been established by Herman Witkin, Jerome Kagan and others--a direction which we think is more representative of how children behave in multicultural classrooms.

My first experience with cognitive styles came from participating in a cross-national study at Rice University in 1967-68. We worked with four different countries. My responsibility was Mexico and we had two communities there, one in northern Mexico and one in the interior of the country. The other countries were Holland, Norway and Italy. In each of the countries we chose two communities which differed from each other in the lifestyles of their residents. We collected data on the learning styles of children and the socialization styles of mothers. The thing that was most surprising about the data was the fact that there was so much similarity in the learning

styles of children across countries. The learning styles of the children in one community in Mexico overlapped with those of another community in Holland and of still another in Italy as well.

The data we collected in this study also led us to become critical and skeptical of the validity of Witkin's theory on cognitive styles. The theory states that when people are born, since they are undeveloped and undifferentiated, they are field dependent. Then, as years progress, they become more differentiated and more developed, and thus field dependent. Our findings showed that in places like Italy and Mexico people were field dependent, yet they were competent and they were perfectly well adjusted to the environment; so we began to question Witkin's theory of psychological differentiation, and finally we decided that it is not a question of being born field dependent and then becoming field dependent, but development is taking place along the two different dimensions, field dependent and field independent. Since American culture values field independence, Witkin and his colleagues had ignored the importance of field dependence.

Following that, we studied three ethnic groups in Houston (Mexican-Americans or Chicanos, Blacks and Anglos). Again, we found that while many Black children and Chicano children were field dependent they were also very successful in school and in their homes.

The results of the Houston study also led us to substitute the word "sensitive" for "dependent" when referring to people whose predominant style was not field independent. This helped to avoid misconceptions, such as people assuming that field dependent means dependent personality. What we were talking about was really a sensitivity to the environment, the sensitivity to the social and material environment and not really a dependence on the environment. At around this time we also became interested in the tremendous differences that we saw within the ethnic groups. For example, we found that the Anglo females would overlap with a lot of the scores of children in the Black and the Chicano groups. We also found that there were Anglo males who were as field sensitive or as field independent as Chicano or Black males or females. This diversity astounded us and eventually led us to develop our theory of bicultural and bicognitive development. That is, the diversity in a person's learning style is related to the diversity of socialization and life experiences which he/she has been exposed to.

Our research then focussed on acculturation. It there is tremendous diversity within Mexico itself, if you can go to two communities in Mexico and find that the children in northern Mexico are quite different from the children in southern Mexico, what would you expect within the U.S. with Mexican-Americans who have migrated from different areas in Mexico and were living in different American communities? We did an acculturation study of cognitive styles in mothers and children in three communities in southern California where we expected differences in values and lifestyles. Our results showed that there were considerable differences between the cognitive styles of children and mothers in the three communities. Children and mothers whose values and lifestyles were more similar to those of communities in rural Mexico were more field sensitive, while those whose lifestyles and beliefs were more alien to mainstream American urban communities were more field independent.

In a later study of mothers' teaching styles we found that field sensitive mothers would use modeling in teaching their children. The field independent mothers would tend to use more of the discovery approaches in teaching their children. The rewards used by the mothers were different. The field sensitive mothers would reward their children, even when they got the answers wrong, in order to sustain the child's interest in the task. The field independent mothers, we found, would only reward their children when they got the answers right. The application of this finding is that field sensitive children may become discouraged in classrooms in which teachers only give rewards when an answer is right.

The big breakthrough for us came when we began to observe children in classrooms. All this time people had just assessed cognitive styles of kids or adults with the Embedded Figures Test or the Rod-and-Frame Test and then assumed that they were field sensitive or field independent based on their scores. Well, when we started observing kids in the classrooms we found the scores on the test did not "jive" with behaviors. Many times, people who had scored in what was supposed to be the field independent way were actually behaving in a very field sensitive way and vice versa. The really surprising thing was that many people behaved in one way or another depending on the task they were asked to do or the kind of group they were in at the time. We also observed that children and adults who were bilingual and bicultural also seemed to be the ones who were most flexible or bicognitive--that they could switch from one style to the other; they could use behaviors of both styles. So we abandoned the idea that people are either field dependent or independent and focused instead on the relationship of cognitive flexibility to biculturalism and multiculturalism. That is, we concluded that people who participate in more than one culture are exposed to more diversity in socialization and life experiences and thus develop more flexibility in their orientations to life.

We encouraged the use of behavior observation instruments rather than the traditional cognitive styles tests because we discovered that these tests are biased in a field independent direction and that they do not assess field sensitivity. The behavior observation instruments reflect our acknowledgement of the complexity of the concept of cognitive styles. We can observe behaviors of the children in the different settings of the classroom, the playground, the community. We focused on four areas in observing the behaviors of children. We focused on relationship to peers, on thinking and problem-solving styles, the instructional relationship to teacher, and the personal relationship to the teacher.

Over the years we have found that the most difficult thing about implementing the bicognitive program in the classroom is training the teachers to be sensitive to the preferred learning styles of children and to be cognizant of those styles in which the children need more experience. It is difficult for teachers to encourage children to become flexible using behaviors from both styles. We tried many approaches to implementation. Back in the early 70's we tried matching teachers to kids. We would have big classrooms with two aides and a teacher and we would assess the preferred teaching styles of the teachers and aides. We would also assess the preferred learning style of the children and then match teachers and children, putting them into three different groups--a field sensitive group, a middle group, and a field independent group. We found that while this approach worked well in certain areas, it did

not work well in others. This approach was not getting the teachers to become flexible, to become multi-cognitive in their approaches to teaching. S then we decided to change our approach. We trained teachers to teach multi-cognitively or bicognitively right away, rather than waiting and matching teachers to kids.

Recently we have started to train teachers to view everything that goes on in the classroom as reflecting cognitive styles. For example, most tests are given in a very field independent style. The behavior of the teacher affects how children do on the tests. Preferred teaching styles also reflect independent/sensitive modes. How do we get teachers and aides to see that they have a preferred teaching style which they may use consistently with al children? How can we alert them to the fact that the format and content of curriculum materials can "pull" them in a field sensitive or field independe style inadvertantly?

We are now focusing on the reward system teachers use in the classroom. Of particular interest are the cognitive styles reflected in these reward systems.

As you have no doubt concluded from my presentation, introducing cultur into the classroom has been a long, difficult, but nevertheless worthwhile, struggle. The model which we are introducing here today, Nuevas Fronteras d Aprendizaje, reflects the sum of experience and knowledge we have gained fro our work in classrooms over the past nine or ten years. It is our hope that you will find our model useful in achieving the important goal we are all striving for--ensuring equality of educational opportunity for all preschool children. We hope that respect for cultural and individual differences becomes an indispensible part of preschool education in the United States.

# UN MARCO ABIERTO CURRICULUM MODEL

Michael L. Hanes, Ph.D.
Marina I. Flores

## The Classroom Program

The starting point for Un Marco Abierto is the arrangement of the classroom into interest areas, for example, a block area, house area, art area, quiet area, construction area, music area and animal and plant area. These interest areas are stocked with "real-life" materials which children can use to play and learn--a miniature stove, cooking equipment and "dress-up" clothes in the house area; simple tools, wood and carpet scraps in the construction area; tambourines, bells, record player and tape recorder in the music area. Teachers assist children in using the interest areas in educational activities based on the children's own choices and interests: e.g., planting a miniature garden, building an airplane, "play-acting" what a farmer or fireman does, or what goes on in a gas station. Because the curriculum aims at helping children to learn to make decisions, solve problems and exercise self-discipline, children are offered many opportunities to choose their own materials and projects and to work independently, but the teachers are always available to insure that the child's activity is purposeful and challenging, and to help the child solve problems which arise.

The classroom day in Un Marco Abierto is divided into a regular daily routine which children learn to anticipate and understand. Central to the routine is the daily "plan-do-review" cycle, in which each child, with the assistance of the teacher, plans a project, works on it in one of the interest centers, then reviews and evaluates it later. This cycle gives children the opportunity to choose their own projects, while providing a structure which requires them to organize their work and to use thinking and language skills to plan and describe it. In addition to the plan-do-review cycle, the daily routine also includes times for children to work at teacher-initiated activities in small and large groups. Some typical group activities might be a trip to a local fire station, then making up a song about the trip the following day; learning to use pipecleaners or some other new art materials; or sorting buttons to learn shapes and colors. The daily routine has several advantages: it enables children to pursue their own interests, and to work at their own pace and level; at the same time it insures that activities in the classroom are neither chaotic nor purposeless. The daily routine also provides children with many different kinds of experiences: independent work, small- and large-group activities and exposure to a variety of materials and tools.

Teachers also follow a routine in an Un Marco Abierto classroom. The teaching team plans daily for their classroom. Teachers plan around certain "key experiences" which have been identified from Piaget's developmental theory as providing opportunities for intellectual growth in areas such as languages, culture, number concepts and spatial relations. We have also identified some general teaching strategies which can be used to carry out the key experiences. Planning is individualized and must take into account the developmental level via careful observations in the classroom, and the use of a developmental checklist called the Child Observation Record (COR) which helps them maintain

a detailed record of each child's progress. Teachers use the COR as one tool which enables them to plan activities which are challenging for each child, and which strengthen a broad range of abilities. The following sections provide more detail of language and culture, staff training and development, as well as program evaluation.

## Language and Culture Learning

As a bilingual/bicultural curriculum, Un Marco Abierto ultimately represents a view that the support and maintenance of different language communities is central to full, literate bilingualism. The program, therefore, places a value on self-esteem, pride in one's own nationality, the utilization of one's linguistic resources and the learning of a second language.

Since language use is generally context-bound, Un Marco Abierto ties language directly to the child's ongoing activities in an open supportive environment. Rather than disassociating first and second languages by organizing language "lessons" using specific time periods, the program permits both languages to emerge naturally and be integrated in all periods of the daily routine. This provides opportunities for children to learn by interacting with peers and adults from both first and second language groups. By emphasizing both languages (using simultaneous translation and code-switching), the program creates an environment in which both languages are equally accepted and respected, and in which the child's learning does not have to be deferred until a second language is acquired.

This approach to language learning may be described as natural. It draws upon strategies that encourage children to describe objects, people, feelings, and to express their needs and interests as they engage in meaningful activities. It requires that the adults serve as language resources for the children, helping them solve problems, extending their experiences and serving as language models. In the classroom the adults must demonstrate and maintain the equal status of both languages when speaking to other team members or children.

While Un Marco Abierto does not provide a set of specified language lessons or activities, it does provide a framework upon which teachers, children and parents can build. Un Marco Abierto's bilingual approach implies that because young children learn best when actively involved, first and second language learning must be closely connected to this involvement and not presented abstractly through systematic lessons employing language techniques based on teaching a foreign language to adults.

Culture, too, is something to be experienced--especially for young children--not something to be didactically taught. Inseparable from the language of the child, culture becomes the broad context within which all education takes place. Un Marco Abierto views culture as the context of a group of people whose whole range of social values, customs, traditions and social institutions distinguish their way of life. Culture encompasses tools, dress, shelter, modes of transportation, a people's history, artistic productions, social organization, family structures, marriage customs, religion and language.

By the time children reach preschool age, they have internalized the bases of their culture; through language and other forms of representation (e.g., role

play, art) they begin to communicate information about who they are, the dialect they speak, their family life and neighborhood.

Adults must build upon children's interests and experiences on the basis of knowledge of their immediate culture. Un Marco Abierto does not emphasize teaching remote or abstract facts because the preschool child has not yet developed sufficient understanding of time concepts to really know, for example, what "in 1492" means. However, we recognize and do emphasize the importance of using books and materials depicting historical events and figures. Of course, these materials should be developmentally appropriate. Un Marco Abierto also suggests that adults emphasize key experiences that will help to maintain and support the child's first culture and facilitate his or her adjustment to a second culture.

## Parent Involvement

Un Marco Abierto provides adults with a framework for sharing their language and culture with the children and other adults through a team teaching effort. "Adult" is defined broadly to include teacher, paraprofessionals and parents. All these individuals become potential resources for each other and the children. The team teaching approach attempts to eliminate role differentiation on the basis of attained educational levels or specific language competency. Everyone works together and shares equally in the decision-making process.

This, of course, means that parents play an especially important role as linguistic and cultural models. All of the adults are encouraged to speak their own dialect, to learn from each other and, most important, to learn from the children.

## Staff Development and Training

Staff training is a critical part of the ongoing process of learning how children think and act. Each adult on the teaching team needs to become a skilled and sensitive observer of children. Consequently, training is a continuous process for parents, teachers and paraprofessionals. The curriculum model includes written and audio-visual materials to assist teachers, parents and paraprofessionals in implementing the curriculum.

The amount and intensity of staff training required to implement the High/Scope model is dependent on a number of variables. In essence, the major considerations include: (1) the extent to which a match exists between the High/Scope model and the present curriculum; (2) the existing competencies of the present staff; and (3) the amount of administrative and organizational support for the implementation of the curriculum.

Concurrent with the development of the curriculum model, project staff have generated training strategies which facilitate the development of staff competence in the Un Marco Abierto curriculum. The general plan and strategies for staff training are the result of ten years work in the area of in-service training with preschool teachers.

The training model that has developed over the years has been modified to fit the particular needs of preschool and Head Start programs implementing Un Marco Abierto. The training model has four basic components:

1) Classroom observation and feedback by a trained consultant;

2) A series of systematically designed workshops for teachers and administrators which includes discussions, audio-visual materials and self-assessment forms;

3) Classroom demonstration teaching;

4) Assistance and training in the development of an on-site curriculum assistant.

Previous experience has shown that each of these components is essential for the full implementation of the model. In most cases, the specific organization of the components will vary as a function of the available resources and existing needs at a particular site.

Most importantly, program directors, parents and staff need to recognize that staff training and development is critical to the implementation of any curriculum model. In most cases, the specific organization of the components will vary as a function of the available resources and existing needs at a particular site.

## Program Evaluation

Making decisions about program effectiveness and efficiency is an ongoing process which requires the active attention of parents and staff. While many educators view evaluation as basically or only an assessment process, Un Marco Abierto emphasizes three equally important aspects of decision-making with regard to preschool programs.

First, there are specific sources of information which need to be considered when making decisions about a program. These sources are the major participants in the program: parents, children and teachers. Each source provides a unique perspective on the curriculum and it is these perspectives taken together that provide a complete picture of the program.

Second, each information source can be assessed by both informal and formal means. To aid in the gathering of information from each of these sources, a number of formal instruments have been developed for parents, teachers and children. These instruments have been administered in a number of field test situations to maximize the clarity of the information gained and minimize the potential for inaccurate interpretation. In addition to these formal instruments, parents and staff are encouraged to share information obtained from personal experiences and observation. Included in the curriculum materials are guidelines for parents and teachers to use in gathering observational information. Table 1 shows the assessment procedures and information sources that have been integrated in the model.

Third, the model emphasizes mutual problem solving as an effective technique for reaching decisions about program effectiveness and efficiency. Community and parent involvement is an integral part of the High/Scope Open Framework model. The evaluation design recognizes that all participants in the program have a role in the decision-making process. Not only are all participants expected to provide input for decision-making, they are expected to take an active role in making decisions. More specifically, parents and staff have an equal responsibility in resolving implementation issues. This process of group decision-making depends on cooperation, respect and compromise and requires active involvement and concern by parents, staff and the community.

## Curriculum Materials

Development of Un Marco Abierto has included the production of a complete set of curriculum materials for implementation.

For teachers a complete guide discusses the basic philosophical foundations for the curriculum and includes chapters on planning and evaluating progress, room arrangement, daily routine, language, culture, and working with parents. The teacher's guide also includes child assessment and teacher assessment forms which are essential for teacher planning and evaluation.

Since in-service training is an integral aspect of Un Marco Abierto, the curriculum materials include a guide for trainers who are involved in implementation. The trainer's guide includes materials for observing teachers and designing workshops on each of the areas of the curriculum. Accompanying the trainer's guide are five audio-visual programs to be used in teacher training.

The curriculum also includes written materials for parents. The basic aspects of the curriculum are explained in five booklets specifically written for parents. Each booklet corresponds to an audio-visual program which teachers can use as a part of the parent involvement program. All parent materials are in Spanish and English.

Table 1

Sources of Information and Means of Evaluation

| Child | | Teacher | | Parent | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Formal Means: | Child Observation Record (COR) | Formal Means: | Preschool Teacher Training Profile | Formal Means: | Bilingual/Bicultural Parent Interview and Assessment Schedule (Forms A and B) |
| Informal Means: | Classroom Observations; feedback from parent | Informal Means: | Classroom Observations; feedback from trainers; checklists | Informal Means: | Home Visitation, classroom involvement |

# AMANECER CURRICULUM MODEL

Rebecca Barrera

The four curriculum models all have specific issues and tasks they have to address, so they are similar in many ways. Among those things that are similar about the models is that they must have goals for teachers, students, and parents. Each proposes a unique way of addressing each of these goals. Another thing that is similar is that they are designed together with a Head Start program. None of the models were developed in isolation. This aspect makes them different from other models that have been developed throughout the nation. This is what makes them so perfect for Head Start...because they address the Head Start concepts so well. In addition, they are all supposed to be compatible with CDA. Each has their own way of achieving this compatibility. Each will be very compatible with your CDA program. Teachers who have been in CDA will find it very easy to implement one of the models, and programs that are implementing a model will find it very easy to move into a CDA credentialing effort.

The model is divided into manageable parts or building blocks that fit together into an integrated model. Even our blocks reflect the concept of manageable parts or "chunks" of information. These books are color-coded and small, so that people can take the material home and return the next day with a list of ideas to implement. It is much easier than carrying around one big, fat manual.

We tried to incorporate all of the information we obtained from teachers as we were developing the model into the whole concept of what AMANECER would be. Teachers indicated they wanted things that were easy to grasp and they wanted information about materials. In response, we came up with "Idea Cards". They asked for ways to communicate with parents and we came up with "Cartitas". They asked us for better ways of outlining what a week's activities should look like, so we developed a "Week of Planning" guide that would be easy to use.

The model has four major parts:

1. A series of little books which contain all of the different subjects that a teacher needs to understand in order to implement the model. Some address a particular CDA competency.

2. Supplemental materials. These are consumables or things that the teacher will need many of, such as:

   a. Cartitas
   b. Daily lesson plans
   c. Idea cards

3. Five slide shows.

4. Staff training materials.

## Field Sites

The three sites where the model is being piloted are all in Texas: San Antonio, Corpus Christi, and Laredo.

San Antonio is the oldest site. This site has been instrumental in the pilot testing of the material and in assisting with the design and development of the model. This program has twelve teachers and one center manager. The teachers are located in six different classrooms under one roof. The center has approximately 120 children. The language dominance of the children ranges from monolingual Spanish or English to a variety of bilingual levels. The center is located within the community it serves.

In Corpus Christi we are working with six teachers. These teachers are in two different buildings. One classroom is in one building and two other classrooms are in another building about 15 to 20 miles away. There are approximately 60 children in this program. The children are largely English dominant or bilingual. Not all of the children in these classrooms are from the immediate community. Some are bused to the centers.

The Laredo site has five classrooms in three different buildings. There are approximately 100 children at this site. Approximately 99 to 100% of these children are Spanish dominant. The center is located within the community.

AMANECER, being process oriented, fits very well with the features of each program.

Some of the results of the implementation of the model into these sites include the following:

1. We have observed that teachers have acquired new skills such as their ability to observe and report children's skills, their ability to critically select materials that are linguistically, developmentally and culturally appropriate for children, and their ability to have a classroom that is challenging and responsive to the children they are working with. We have observed that teachers have also gained self-confidence. We have also observed the development of organization and planning skills. This is evidenced in the way the classrooms were organized and managed and the ability displayed by the teachers in initiating projects with parents and community members.

2. We have also observed good results in the progress that the children in the projects are making. This has been possible as a result of the record-keeping aspects of the model. This progress has been observed in language usage. In the AMANECER model all children in the classroom are learning both languages (Spanish/English). Children are placed in two Circle Time groups--Circle Time being the language lesson or the language component for the classroom. We have observed considerable growth in both the first and second languages. We have observed children becoming independent as teachers arrange the classroom so that children are given responsibilities and choices. We have also observed psychomotor growth.

3. Not only have we observed increased participation on the part of parents, but we have also observed a maintenance of this involvement over time.

4. We have also observed leadership qualities developing in teachers and parents. This is evidenced by the self-initiated projects on the part of teachers.

5. We have observed increased awareness on the part of parents of their children's instructional program. This increase, we feel, relates to the record-keeping materials. Teachers use these materials in parent conferences to provide information on children which is concrete.

Field Site Training

The major emphasis for the past year has been on the development of training packages which compliment and facilitate the total implementation of the model. In developing the training packages, we wanted to keep three main ideas in mind. First of all, we wanted to make the training packages so that anyone with minimal training would be able to implement the training. Secondly, we wanted to make the training packages completely self-contained packages with objectives, activities, and suggestions. Finally, we wanted the training package to convey quality information on the model itself. Keeping these three things in mind, we set up a criteria for ourselves to follow in developing the training packages. The criteria used in the design included the following:

First, the package was developed for persons with early childhood education background. Not necessarily a degreed person, but someone with the experience and background. By this we mean for someone who is knowledgeable about children and the preschool setting.

Secondly, we wanted the training packages to be easy to follow and understand.

Thirdly, we wanted the objectives to be clearly stated.

Fourthly, we wanted the training packages to be flexible.

A total of thirteen training packages were developed using these criteria.

The AMANECER model is presently being prepared for publication and should be available sometime this fall.

The model is also presently undergoing evaluation by Juarez and Associates.

# BILINGUAL/MULTICULTURAL CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION

## [CURRICULUM EVALUATION]

### EVALUATION OF BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL CURRICULUM MODELS

Luis C. Moll, Ph.D.

The evaluation of the Curriculum models will be conducted by Juarez and Associates, Inc., of Los Angeles, California. The overall purpose of the evaluation is to provide information which will permit ACYF to determine whether or not the four models have the potential of using, effectively, the assets that Spanish-speaking preschool children bring with them to Head Start programs and whether or not these models are replicable at other geographical locations.

The evaluators are contracted to collect information on the following areas:

1. The feasibility of successfully implementing the models in more than one setting.

2. The extent to which the models, once implemented, are meeting their objectives.

3. The extent to which the models are greeted favorably by Head Start staff, parents, and lay community members.

Finally, a set of pamphlets have to be developed that summarize all the information that is to be collected. The purpose of the pamphlets is to aid in the dissemination of the four models to interested Head Start programs. Therefore, the pamphlets will include descriptions of the models, implementation information, assessment of the specific strengths of each model, and information regarding the impact of each model on parents, children, and teachers.

In light of these evaluation goals, Juarez and Associates has developed a multimeasure approach to the assessment of the programs' process and outcome behaviors. In general terms, such an approach stresses the need to observe young children's behaviors in context over time and from multiple perspectives, thereby avoiding reliance on solely pre- and post-testing to assess the effectiveness of a model program. To carry out such a multimethod, contextual strategy Juarez and Associates has carefully trained and will place at each evaluation site a test supervisor to train local testers and to oversee the collection of the test data, an interview supervisor who will be responsible for training local interviewers and supervising the collection of parent interview data, and field observers to collect ethnographic and other observational data at various points during the academic year.

The multimethod data collection procedures used in this evaluation enables Juarez and Associates to examine the effects of specific components of each program on parents, teachers, and children. It also permits more complete interpretation of quantitative results, a better understanding of the pattern of results for a particular model across sites, crucial data for the assessment of implementation, the generation of new hypothesis for analysis, and suggestions for re-analysis of results that do or do not find differences between treatment and control groups.

# BILINGUAL/MULTICULTURAL STAFF TRAINING

## PREPARING STAFF TO MEET THE SPECIAL NEEDS OF BILINGUAL/MULTICULTURAL CHILDREN

Jeannette Watson

Our training was developed as a nine month program providing up to 24 hours of college credit that could lead to a Master's of Education degree. Half of the training was based on academic work and half on field work. The academic sessions were conducted on campus four days per month and consisted of lectures, seminars, or workshops. Field work was practiced the rest of the month and involved teaching CDA competencies to two or three child care workers in Head Start or related centers that had a predominance of Spanish-speaking children.

The idea of this training was that, to become competent, the student training counselors should begin to train prospective CDA's while they themselves are still in training and under supervision. We coined the title "training counselor" for these trainees because it more adequately described their role.

The model curriculum itself was designed as a program on which other programs could be patterned. It was based on federal CDA guidelines which point out the need for counselors who, in addition to training, can provide two special services: (1) help trainees with problem solving or refer them to appropriate sources of help; and (2) help them identify and work toward long-term career development goals.

There were four levels in the curriculum model. At the first level were the faculty members. They constitute the teaching and evaluation component. The next level were the training counselors who served as both learners as well as teachers. On the third level were the CDA trainees. Finally, and most importantly, were the children.

The basic course content focused on four areas of study:

1. Child Development
2. Language
3. Culture
4. Leadership

A large number of modules have been written to teach competencies in those four areas.

The modules on Child Development rely, to an extent, on the student training counselors' previous experience in teaching or caring for young children. They cover basic competencies that emphasize two kinds of concepts: (1) those important for creating the kind of early childhood center that can contribute to the personal growth and development of each child; and (2) those essential for the training counselor to become a competent teacher.

The Language modules are designed to develop language proficiency. Although there are instruments to assess the academic and literate proficiency in Spanish, very few are designed to assess the proficiency needed by a teacher of young children for using Spanish as the language of classroom instruction.

The modules on Culture are written to enable the training counselor to become knowledgeable about the cultural background of the children in his/her center. The modules stress the importance of all cultures.

The Leadership modules focus on two types of skills: (1) those that must be mastered in any educational setting; and (2) those that are essential for the bilingual-multicultural setting. There are modules written specifically to provide basic understanding about bilingual education itself, its philosophy and its history. This knowledge is necessary for training counselors to understand and to be able to support their position on bilingual education.

By its very nature this (training) program requires bilingual-multicultural skills. This does not mean that other skills should be ignored.

The field training puts theory into practice. This type of training is critical to the program. This type of training can take place in Head Start centers, private or public Day Care, laboratory schools and Kindergarten.

As part of their own training, training counselors conduct training for CDA trainees one afternoon per week and supervise their trainees one or more days per month. This enables the training counselor to put into practice the knowledge they have gained in the academic sessions. It also provides a setting for the Field Supervisors to observe the training counselor as she/he works with the trainees in "modeling" the CDA competencies. On the basis of these observations, the Field Supervisor can discuss the training counselor's strength and weakness and prescribe more work in the appropriate areas. This assessment of field skills is done on a monthly basis.

The main components of the Field Experience for the trainees are to work directly with children in a bilingual setting, to serve as a training counselor for one or more CDA candidates, and to receive a monthly assessment of field skills so they can continually improve.

The Field Supervisor is the "key" person in the training program. This person administers the training counselors' internship, monitors field experiences, serves as a judge of the training counselors' competencies in the field, determines whether or not the training counselor has successfully completed the program, and serves as the link between the academic and field portions of the program.

The program leaves it up to the training institution to decide how to cover the material and to integrate the academic and field experience. It has the ability to be adopted in the host institution's time frame, expanding it into a longer course of study, if appropriate, or even concentrating the academic courses through federal programs.

The modules on culture can be adapted to fit the cultures of the children in a particular center setting.

The training program goes beyond the technicalities of making a long-term commitment to the CDA concept. The program is designed to improve the availability of services available to young Spanish-speaking children.

Students for the training program were selected on the basis of their apparent potential, as well as other very specific background experiences. By the end of the pilot program we were able to pinpoint the characteristics and qualifications of those who had excelled in the program. These included:

1. Knowledge of child development theory and early childhood education, with at least 12 hours of previous college credit.

2. Two or three years of successful experience working with three- to five-year-olds.

3. Successful experience working with adults and parents.

4. Have bilingual skills and be bicultural and equally proficient in both English and Spanish.

5. Personal capacity for relating effectively to young children and the ability to model this capacity.

6. Availability for training as indicated by the granting of "released time" by their employing agency.

Early in the program we helped the trainees recognize that they were responsible for achieving specific competencies. They were told that the program staff were there merely to guide them in developing these competencies.

The trainees were given a three month probationary period to enable the students to counsel themselves out of the program.

To enter the program, trainees need not have the CDA, but should be able to exemplify the CDA competencies.

The training was individualized. Trainees were assessed to determine his/her competencies and then a training plan developed around their areas of weakness. This plan was developed by the trainees, in consultation with the Field Supervisor and the academic faculty.

We feel the program was successful and will be available to help whoever wants to adopt the program or adapt it to their setting.

# TESTING BILINGUAL/MULTICULTURAL PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

## EL CIRCO: AN ASSESSMENT BATTERY FOR USE WITH PRESCHOOL-AGED, SPANISH-SPEAKING CHILDREN

Diana Glad, Ph.D.

In my talk today I am going to be doing three general overviews of the EL CIRCO project. It was a three-year effort, and to try to trim it down to a half hour or 45 minute presentation takes a little bit of doing. If you can see the array of instruments that are on that table, you will notice that it is quite an extensive array of assessment batteries. I will be talking about the philosophy that underlies the assessment battery, the history of development of EL CIRCO, and, finally, I will give you a description of the 12 tests that comprise the battery.

### I. Philosophical Issues

EL CIRCO is built upon a philosophy that measurement can and should be an integral part of early childhood education. It was felt that the needs of early childhood education could best be met by an assessment battery which emphasizes the complexity of the child and the broad range of skills needed that characterize his/her development. The EL CIRCO theory includes an array of instruments (as you see there on the table), each measuring an important dimension of the preschooler's capabilities. The instruments were designed to be used within the limits of the time, financial resources, and measurement expertise typical of many Head Start, Kindergarten and beginning first-grade programs without sacrificing the technical quality and the validity demanded by decisions affecting the development of children.

Four concerns are primary to EL CIRCO. First of all, there is a need for valid information about the diverse competencies of young Spanish-background children upon which educational decisions regarding diagnostic and instructional programs can be based. Second, the need to avoid the errant classification of thousands of Spanish-background children. Unfortunately, we know that this is a situation that has characterized educational practices in the United States. Third, there is a need for effective tools for use in the evaluation of Spanish-background children. Finally, the need for more information about language problems that are common to the U.S. public schools and that children from Spanish backgrounds are facing.

### II. History

The EL CIRCO measures were designed to provide for the assessment needs of preschool children from Spanish-speaking backgrounds. The development of the measures began in 1975 with funding by a very generous grant from the then Office of Child Development, now ACYF. The EL CIRCO tests were to be developed using the ETS' CIRCUS test battery as a model. (CIRCUS is a comprehensive preschool assessment series developed by ETS in 1975.)

To help meet the concerns for valid, reliable, and effective assessment tools in Spanish, and they are ample concerns, a Cultural Advisory Committee was

formed at the very inception of the EL CIRCO project. This cultural advisory committee was comprised of leading educators from Mexican-American communities, the Puerto Rican communities, and the Cuban communities across the U.S. During the early meetings, this advisory committee worked with the ETS staff to review the CIRCUS battery and to see: which measures would be appropriate for use with Spanish-speaking children; whether those measures could be translated; whether they had to be adapted in light of cultural differences; and, finally, whether there were some instruments that would simply require brand new test development.

From these early meetings, a decision was made to have an assessment battery of 11 instruments that would be adapted in one way or another from the CIRCUS instrument, plus a Language Check that would be a totally distinct feature of the EL CIRCO battery. The Language Check was considered necessary to avoid the misuse of the EL CIRCO tests with children who were not proficient in Spanish, just as ability tests in English had been given to Spanish-speaking children who were not proficient in English. We did not want to be guilty of the same error but in reverse.

Eleven measures were chosen to be developed using the CIRCUS battery as a model. These eleven measures are listed in Table 1. As you can see, the tests that have been adapted directly from the CIRCUS battery are on the left-hand side. The tests that have been newly developed for EL CIRCO are listed in the right-hand column. For those tests that are adaptations, translations were done from English to Spanish with provisions made, when necessary, for cultural differences. The newly developed tests are those that measure the children's comprehension and speaking ability in Spanish and, as such, needed to be tailored to the specific features of the Spanish language.

There were several processes in the development of EL CIRCO that were necessary in framing the very specifications of the test. On the simplest level of test development, we had straight translation done from English to Spanish by using three independent translating teams. One team was comprised of Mexican-American educators from the Southwest; another, from the New York area of Puerto Rican background; and the third, from Miami, a Cuban-American team. The translations were then reviewed and compiled into one set of instructions with, in some instances, alternate phrasing given as options to accommodate the differences in vocabulary and idiomatic expressions that were more familiar to one cultural group than the others. It is interesting to note that we had been forewarned that Mexicans speak a different type of Spanish than do Puerto Ricans, who speak a different Spanish than Cubans. Yet the differences were not insurmountable and we were able to devise instructions that were equally comprehensible to the three major Spanish-speaking cultures residing in the United States. With cultural adaptation, the translation process was a relatively simple matter.

However, we did have to watch out for a problem that is common to many test translations. It was felt that the difficulty level of the language used in the Spanish translation might be somewhat higher than in the English original, due to the frequency of some words in English and their less frequent counterparts in Spanish. I think one example may suffice to illustrate this point. Since we were building on a circus theme, we used pictures of jugglers and acrobats as the basis for some of our items. The word juggler is fairly frequent in English, and we use the verb, to juggle, in a variety of contexts. We juggle

balls, we juggle books, we even juggle payments. English-speaking children do not have a problem in understanding what a juggler is. Yet we anticipated that *Spanish-speaking children would* have a problem with "prestidigitator". We wanted to maintain the circus theme, since our experience was that children enjoyed seeing the pictures that formed part of the CIRCUS test series. So we used "hombres" or "niñas" when referring to the circus performers presented. We had to do quite a number of minor adaptations such as these, although they are probably more noteworthy for the quantity of occasions in which they were required rather than the difficulty of choosing a solution to a particular problem.

After the items were written, they were reviewed by our Cultural Advisory Committee and then pretested. During the pretest administrations, all of which were given by bilingual examiners who were from the same region as the children tested, we had a second opportunity to review the appropriateness of the language used. The examiners gave us further suggestions of where revisions were appropriate from a regional perspective, and we incorporated those suggestions when assembling the actual forms used for norming. More than 15,000 children were tested in the norming administration, although, of course, no child took all twelve tests. More than 500 sites across the United States were involved in the norming of EL CIRCO over a two-year period.

## III. Description of the Tests

Let me now briefly describe the actual tests of the EL CIRCO battery. I have already mentioned the Language Check, which is given to each child before actual testing occurs to make sure that the child's grasp of Spanish is sufficient to be tested in that language. If not, EL CIRCO is simply not appropriate for that child. However, if the child does "pass" the Language Check then it is appropriate to select those tests from EL CIRCO that match your educational objectives.

Cuanto y Cuantos. This is a measure of quantitative concepts. The content areas include counting, relational terms, and numerical concepts. There are 39 items in all.

Parecidos. This is a test of visual discrimination and is comprised of simple and complex matching items. The child is asked to match letters, numbers, and drawings. There is a total of 27 items.

Copia lo que Veas is a test of the child's perceptual-motor coordination. The child is presented with letters and numbers and asked to copy them. (15 items)

Como Suenan Las Palabras. This is a measure of phonemic discrimination. The child hears a pair of words that differ only by one consonant or vowel (for example, "boca, bota" or "ala, ola"). He or she is then asked to select the picture that depicts one or the other. (24 items)

Para Qué Sirven Las Palabras and What Words Are For measures the child's receptive language or ability to comprehend differences between syntactic or grammatical markers.

In Para Qué Sirven Las Palabras, the child is asked to distinguish between specific features that govern Spanish. The content areas measure verbal inflections, prepositions, plurals, possessives, adjectival agreement, and word order of reflexives, indirect and direct objects. (38 items) What Words Are For requires that the child do similar tasks, but in content areas that reflect specific features of the English language. (For instance, English does not require agreement of the adjective and the noun modified.) The content areas for What Words Are For include verbal inflections, prepositions, word order of relative pronouns, active and passive voice, and direct and indirect object. (37 items) It should be noted that What Words Are For has a greater range in content area than does the original CIRCUS test, since it is to be used with children at varying stages of proficiency in English.

Escuchen Esto Cuento is comprised of 25 items that tell a story about children going to a circus. It measures the child's ability to understand spoken Spanish. It is similar to Para Qué Sirven Las Palabras, but does not focus on grammar. Rather, it measures the child's ability to apply vocabulary, grammar, and syntax for meaningful discourse.

Mira y Recuerda is a measure of visual and associative memory. The child is shown a total of twenty pictures of circus animals and performers. After each one is shown, the child is asked to select from several pictures the one identical to the picture shown earlier. In some instances, the nicknames of the circus animals are given and the child is then asked to select the animal that "goes with" the nickname.

Pensándolo Bien is a test of the child's problem-solving ability. The 32 items in the test include problem identification, classification, solutions to problems and temporal sequence.

Dímelo Tú and You Say It are measures of the child's productive language in Spanish and in English. Each test is comprised of three parts. The first part measures the child's ability to use language that is grammatically correct. The second part measures the child's ability to use descriptive language (such things as the name, color, function, and size of a particular object). The third part is a measure of the child's ability to use narrative language. The child is shown a picture with a lot of activity going on and is then asked to tell a story about what is happening in the picture. The story is written verbatim by the examiner and then coded according to twelve categories. The categories range from simply labeling the object in the picture presented, to describing the activities, to establishing plot or character development. These are the only tests in the EL CIRCO battery designed to measure divergent thinking; yet, they tell you quite a bit about the child's ability to use language in a creative way.

## IV. Conclusion

EL CIRCO has been developed with the idea of building on a sequential hierarchy of skills. Even with the diversity that is involved across the 12 measures, within each measure there are early acquired skills of relatively low difficulty as well as more advanced skills that are acquired later and that build upon the previously developed skills. To describe performance on these highly diverse

and developmental skills, we use sentence reports to describe typical as well as exceptional performances of children on each test. Score categories are based on the actual performance of the children in the norming sample and can be used to interpret either individual or group results. However, because of the rapid intellectual growth of young children, test results should be interpreted cautiously. An important aspect of any standardized test is that results are not to be taken as gospel truth when making educational decisions. You always have the teacher and parents, as well as other means of measuring a child's intellectual development, in addition to test scores. I hope that these guarded statements will encourage teachers to use their own observations and experiences and not to rely entirely on test results. As a final word of caution, when selecting a particular test to assess the effectiveness of your educational program, make sure that there is a match between the measurement instrument that you select and your actual curriculum. In simple words, be sure that you test what you teach. Thank you.

## RESOURCE CENTER NETWORK

### NATIONAL BILINGUAL/MULTICULTURAL RESOURCE NETWORK (NBN)

The NBN consists of four centers located in DHEW regions with high concentrations of Spanish-speaking families:

Region II, Dr. Iris Sutherland, Director
Teachers College
Columbia University
525 West 120th Street
New York, New York 10027

Region VI, Yolanda Molina, Director
Intercultural Development Research Associates
5835 Callaghan Road
San Antonio, Texas 78228

Region VIII, Steve DelCastillo, Director
InterAmerica Research Associates
910 16th Street
Suite 722
Denver, Colorado 80202

Region IX, Dr. Masako Tanaka, Director
Development Associates
693 Sutter Street
San Francisco, California 94102

All four of the centers in the NBN have the following two purposes:

1. To collect and make available appropriate bilingual/multicultural early childhood materials to Head Start personnel and other persons who are interested in preschool education.

2. To provide on-site training and technical assistance in the use and adaptation of bilingual/multicultural materials, a philosophy and theory of bilingual/multicultural education for implementation of preschool bilingual/multicultural programs, and methods for promoting parent involvement. The training and technical assistance is to be provided to meet the individual needs of the programs served.

Two of the centers (Region II and Region IX) have an additional purpose:

--To train bilingual/bicultural CDA's.

## Collection and Dissemination of Materials

Each of the four centers reviews, selects and processes instructional materials that would be appropriate for the populations they serve. For example, the center in Region II collects materials in English, Spanish, Greek, Chinese, Italian, and Russian. Other centers have material in Chinese and various Indian (Native-American) languages. Some of the materials in each of the centers were ordered from an annotated bibliography that was developed by the center in Region VIII in Denver, Colorado. The centers use a standard procedure for processing materials, and share lists of holdings with each other. Materials and information are disseminated to Head Start programs in the DHEW regions served by the four centers upon request. The requests are filled as quickly as possible, and programs are allowed to keep the material for as long as two or three weeks. The centers have multiple copies of some of the material, to facilitate filling simultaneous orders for the same material.

## Training and Technical Assistance (T/TA)

Each of the four centers is to provide T/TA services to twenty (20) Head Start programs in the regions they serve. The Regional ACYF offices in each of the regions is responsible for identifying the programs to be served.

T/TA is initiated by means of a region-wide workshop, which is used to inform the programs of the services to be provided through the center. These services include a needs assessment to determine the bilingual/multicultural needs of each of the programs. This information is then used as the basis for individualized on-site T/TA. During FY1979-80 this T/TA will be directed towards helping the programs select and implement one of the four bilingual/bicultural curriculum approaches developed under the aegis of the Head Start Strategy for Spanish-speaking Children.

# LEADERSHIP STYLES AND THEIR IMPORTANCE IN HEAD START PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

JoAnn Vasquez, Ph.D.

Today we are going to talk about leadership and management styles. You can have the best curriculum in the world, you can have the best staff in the world, you can have people come to evaluate your program and give you "tens" or "ones", whichever end of the scale they are using as a high rating. You can have all of those things, but if you, as the Director or the Education Coordinator, are not really able to lead that staff and coordinate that staff you will come out with a program of lesser quality.

Leadership is really manifested through your management styles--what you actually do with people. It is not fashionable to talk about leadership today. After Watergate, who wants to be a leader? After some of our leaders get deported or after they get involved in national scandals and payoffs and things like that, who wants to be a leader? It is safer to be managers... almost. Have you ever heard of any managers getting assassinated?

You are really leaders. You can shy away from that term if you want. What I am going to try to help you do today is to show you how to work at leadership from a practical basis...day to day...in the trenches.

Before we get into actual management styles, I want to talk to you about some characteristics of federal projects that are unique, that make federal projects like Head Start different from business, schools, or non-profit organizations. The reason these characteristics are important to look at is because they change your management style. If you do not take these characteristics into consideration, you will not know what you are doing. You will go back and forth; you will try to be authoritarian one day and democratic the next day, and your staff will not know what you are doing. The thing about these particular characteristics is that they are non-negotiable.

The first thing that is non-negotiable is deadlines. In other organizations people can make their own deadlines. There are deadlines on you all the time, whether it is a report your project has to get in, your continuation grant, or whatever...you have deadlines. That will never change in your life. I never knew why they called them deadlines...now I do. By the time you get it done you are dead, and if you do not get it done you are dead. Secondly, you have non-negotiable components you have to work with: Education, Health, Parent Involvement, etc. You are not going to change that. Not only do you have these non-negotiable components, but within the components you have non-negotiable Performance Standards.

Another thing you have that is not going to change is "lay-ons". These are those things that come down from above (e.g., Washington, the big boss, CDA, etc.). You have two types of "lay-ons", expected and unexpected. The expected are those you know about ahead of time, the unexpected creep up on you, and those are as demanding as the expected ones.

There are some things you have to master. If you do not master them you could be the most dynamic, the most charismatic manager, but if you do not know

some basics to begin with, you are dead. These basics are the rules and regulations under which your program is expected to operate. If you do not know them, or if your sponsoring agency does not know them, you more than likely will not know what to do. Another basic thing you need to know is exactly what your sponsoring agency will and will not allow you to do. One of the most important things is to establish a knowledge base; set up a communications network with other Directors or with other Education Coordinators, or both. This network can be used to find out what other projects are doing and to share information on what is and is not working. Just to know who has contracts for Head Start is something worth knowing. It is amazing what you will be able to find out from other Head Start programs.

There are some non-negotiable areas that are not going to change. There is also a knowledge base that you have to have. Some of the knowledge base areas are a little fuzzy. Interpretations often vary depending on the person who interprets these rules and regulations for you. You have to know what to expect, and from whom, regarding these interpretations.

You are in this Head Start business, and if you want to stay in it you owe it to yourself to become involved in some professional development. You are going to have to do it on your own because you are all in different places along the leadership and management ladder.

Let us look at four areas of leadership and management. The following are some areas that I am going to talk about so that you can get in touch with your own feelings about where you are in regard to your leadership and management function in Head Start. We know that there has to be some tension in the leadership and management roles or there is no moving forward or productivity. If we have more tension in our jobs than is normal, in other words, if we have extra tension and are feeling tension almost all of the time, there are stress signs that we should be aware of. It is said that 60% of managers have trouble sleeping at night. This is one of those signs.

Beyond tension, anxiety can affect your job performance. Anxiety is a step beyond tension. Anxiety turns into conflict. One type of conflict is conflict within oneself. Am I good enough to do this job? Am I good enough to be a manager? Do I really want to be an Education Coordinator? Conflict sometimes manifests itself outside of the "self" with other staff members. Conflict can impact home life or create additional conflict there.

If you get to the conflict level, take a good look at what is happening within your management job. It might not be the position for you. Be realistic. Be in a position you should really be in, rather than being in a position where you are in conflict all of the time.

The bottom line is frustration. Not just simple frustration, but frustration that comes over you all of the time. Frustration turned inward becomes depression. When you are depressed about your management position or responsibilities, this is the bottom...do some thinking.

Sometimes you may have a little of each of the above, which is not bad and in some cases may improve your productivity; but if you find yourself in the conflict and frustration areas consistently, take a very close look at what you think of your job. Take a look at how you are operating as a leader.

There is a big question about how much you can change your own style. We must begin, however, to be aware of where we are and where we want to be as leaders. Should we change?

Begin looking at your leadership style by looking at the authoritarian part of your leadership style. An authoritarian makes decisions and announces it. There may be some areas of the management of your programs where you have to be authoritarian--possibly within those areas of your project which involve non-negotiable items. Even though these involve "definites", this does not mean that you have to operate in an authoritarian style. You might have to try to give your staff some type of freedom. For instance, you have a "lay-on" from Washington. If you have enough time, the least you can do is to try to involve your staff members in terms of making their own time-lines to try to accomplish the "lay-on". Time-lines are very important. Give your staff time to become involved in the decision-making process. This move begins to place you into a leadership style in which staff have a little more to say in the decision-making process. The manager makes a tentative decision, subject to change after input is obtained from staff. Decision-making at this point becomes flexible. In moving the leadership style away from authoritarian type, we move into a style in which the group or staff are asked to make the decision. This is a tricky process. This is particularly tricky if you are the Head Start Director and you have a new staff to work with. You have to be careful in this type of situation. In such a situation the staff may make a good decision, but they may make it three weeks late; because the further you move away from the authoritarian style, the more group dynamics come into play. A lot of interaction has to take place. There is a lot of power-grabbing by different people within the group. You have to be very careful on this end of the leadership continuum. What we have as we move away from the authoritarian to more democratic management is what we call "Motivational Management". When you select staff you need to review how they react to various types of leadership styles in terms of the job they are to perform. In other words, (in regards to) the persons you are selecting, (ask yourself): "How are they used to reacting?" Have they been in situations all of the time where they have had a very authoritarian manager? Are you selecting them for a position in which they will have a lot of freedom? Let us look at a hypothetical situation: You are interviewing for an Education Coordinator. The person you are interviewing has been in Head Start for some time, but he or she has been under a Director or in a situation where she or he has been under very strong leadership and worked under a tight time-line. They were told exactly what to do all the time. If you are interviewing for a position where you are going to give the person a lot of freedom in using their own initiative or to exert some leadership, you may not find the person from this setting ideal for what you want. You have to be certain to try to match previous leadership style involvements with the leadership styles in which the prospective employee will be working.

Mismatching might explain, in part, why we have so much turnover in staff in Head Start programs. We are not matching. What we are doing is matching the job description with the person all right, but maybe we are not matching them with our management style. In doing this we have to find our what motivates them. Once we have found out what motivates prospective staff we can determine whether or not they will fit in with our leadership style.

If you are not interested in motivating staff, then you fall on the left, or authoritarian, side of the leadership continuum. However, there are some

staff that are motivated by leadership which falls on the left side. These people always want to know where they stand, and want direction all of the time. Other people want to have some say, but not too much responsibility. Still others want your job. You have to decide what your style of leadership will permit, and employ staff accordingly. Remember, there is no single leadership style that fits all situations all of the time. The key to successful leadership is to be flexible, not fuzzy.